

J. W. Kern

THE CONSERVATION
OF THE FAMILY

THE CONSERVATION OF THE FAMILY

BY
PAUL POPENOE



BALTIMORE
THE WILLIAMS & WILKINS COMPANY
1926

COPYRIGHT 1926
THE WILLIAMS & WILKINS COMPANY

Made in United States of America

Published July, 1926

COMPOSED AND PRINTED AT THE
WAVERLY PRESS
FOR
THE WILLIAMS & WILKINS COMPANY
BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

By PAUL POPENOE



APPLIED EUGENICS (In collaboration with
Roswell H. Johnson)

MODERN MARRIAGE: A Handbook

THE CONSERVATION OF THE FAMILY

CONTENTS

Preface.....	ix
--------------	----

PART I

THE NORMAL FAMILY

Introduction.....	3
I. Type of Mating.....	9
II. Choice of a Mate.....	23
III. Social Sanctions.....	28
IV. Reproduction.....	35
V. Influence.....	39

PART II

CONDITIONS THAT INTERFERE WITH THE NORMAL FUNCTIONING OF THE FAMILY

Introduction.....	47
I. Celibacy and the Ascetic Ideal.....	48
II. Premarital Incontinence.....	56
III. Delayed Marriage.....	68
IV. Broken Homes.....	72
V. Prostitution.....	84
VI. Venereal Diseases.....	91
VII. Infertility.....	96
VIII. Illegitimacy.....	100
IX. Abortion.....	113
X. Inadequate Reproduction in Superior Families.....	125
XI. Excessive Reproduction in Inferior Families.....	137

PART III

MEANS OF SOCIAL CONTROL

Introduction.....	157
I. Education.....	165
II. Public Opinion.....	187
III. Economic Reforms.....	205
IV. Community Organization.....	221

PART IV

CONCLUSION

The Changing Home.....	245
LIST OF REFERENCES.....	255
INDEX.....	259

PREFACE

This book is the complement of my *Modern Marriage: A Handbook* (New York, 1925). In the latter volume I pointed out some of the things that an individual can do to make his marriage more successful. The present book considers mainly the things that an individual can not do for himself, and which society must do for him. The two lines of approach are necessary to get a balanced view of the subject.

In preparing this volume, I have profited by suggestions from many friends, particularly Dr. Thomas H. Haines of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene; Professor Roswell H. Johnson of the University of Pittsburgh, my collaborator in *Applied Eugenics*; Dr. John M. Cooper, associate professor of sociology at the Catholic University of America; Dr. Louis I. Dublin, statistician of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company; and my former colleagues on the staff of the American Social Hygiene Association, especially Dr. M. A. Bigelow, Miss Mary A. Clark, Dr. M. J. Exner, Dr. Thomas W. Galloway, Mrs. G. R. Luce, Dr. Valeria H. Parker, Miss J. B. Pinney, and Mr. George E. Worthington. But no one except myself should be held responsible for anything presented in the following pages.

The section on Illegitimacy, first presented at the annual meeting of the Eugenics Research Association, June 16, 1923, was printed in the *Journal of Social Hygiene*, December, 1923, and I am indebted to Mr. Ray H. Everett, managing editor of that publication, for permission to use it here.

PAUL POPENOE.

Coachella, California.

PART I
THE NORMAL FAMILY

INTRODUCTION

Monogamy, with its ideal of life-long union of a man and a woman for their mutual benefit and for the production of children, has too long been taken for granted, particularly by the normal, law-abiding people who adopt and adhere to that standard, and who make up the great bulk of the population. They think it need not be examined critically. Some of them think it should not be so examined. They react to discussion in a purely emotional way.

Meanwhile, those for whom the old sanctions have no force are criticizing it unmercifully and, because of their lack of any sound basis for criticism, destructively. They themselves fully believe that they are the progressive and scientific members of the community, and that those who cling blindly to monogamy are old-fashioned, non-progressive, behind the times—mid-Victorian, indeed!

The extremists on one side are as irrational as are the extremists on the other. Debating, as each does, largely from prejudice and emotional bias, it is not surprising that they disagree, and that their disagreement is becoming greater all the time.

Why this uncertainty, about one of the oldest and most far-reaching problems of life? Are there no facts from which one may induce sound principles for guidance—whether one accepts the argument of authority, the sanction of religion, or not?

Certainly there are,—plenty of them: facts perfectly familiar to biologists, though evidently little known to many others.

The confusion exists, in the first place, because the problem has been looked at piecemeal; because instead of seeking for the principles involved, reformers have seized each on a small fragment of the whole, and tried to make off with it as his own prize. In the second place, many have forgotten that the whole question of the family is primarily—though by no means exclusively—a

biological question, and it has not usually been examined from the biological side. It is significant that there are few biologists among those who are crying out so loudly for the break-up of the old-fashioned home.

Why is family life not oftener considered from the biological point of view? First, because biology even now forms a much smaller part of formal education than do religion, law, history, and economics. Secondly, because some of the normal biological features are particularly intimate, while some of the abnormal are unpleasant to contemplate. Discussion of both classes has therefore been taboo. But it is now coming to be realized that the family can not prosper if it is thus shrouded in secrecy and befogged with mystery. This book is intended as an elementary introduction to the subject, for readers who have not previously approached it on this side. While it can touch only a few of the salient points, since a complete discussion of so large a topic would require many volumes, it attempts to present the fundamental biological data, together with some data that belong to other sciences but are here regarded from a biological point of view.

As soon as the family is studied biologically, it is seen to represent an evolutionary adaptation for the benefit of mankind. It is therefore no more out of date than is man's habit of walking upright, which is likewise an evolutionary adaptation for his benefit.

True, mankind is not perfectly adapted to monogamy. It is not *perfectly* adapted to anything. It is certainly not perfectly adapted to walking upright. Hernia is the best known of the disabilities entailed by the standing position, but stooped shoulders, flat feet, and a score of other handicaps are likewise results of this "unnatural" mode of locomotion. But no one argues, because of these real disabilities, that mankind should stop trying to walk upright, and return to all-fours, or walk on its hands, or wriggle along on its belly. Common sense recognizes that the upright position is now an essential part of man's nature, and uses every effort to compensate for defects, to remove disabilities, and to make the upright position as efficient as possible.

When common sense becomes a little more prevalent in discussions of marriage, it will necessarily take a similar attitude. It will recognize that man's intelligence and ingenuity are to be exercised in conforming to monogamy, just as in conforming to the upright posture. A person who asserts the necessity of experimenting to find some form of mating better adapted to human nature will be regarded in the same way as one who would proceed down Broadway on his hands and knees, in the hope of finding in that way a better adjustment to his inborn tendencies.

To push the illustration a little farther, there are those who have to wear trusses, or to undergo operations for rupture; there are also those who have to travel in wheel chairs or on crutches. They are not looked on, however, as the bold, emancipated, progressive leaders of the race, but are pitied as defectives who are unable to enjoy the advantages of normal health. In the same way there will always be husbands and wives who can not measure up to the normal standard, and who will require clinics and divorce courts; who even with the help of these will not find happiness. But no one will suppose that they are showing the world something better than it already has, or that their deformed natures represent Emancipation and the Progress of Evolution.

In short, monogamy is one of the biological foundations of society. Many of the excrescences of a legal, social, religious, or economic nature, which the ignorance of ages has plastered on this biological foundation, should be removed. I am wholly in sympathy with the proposal to remove all such excrescences that have outlived their usefulness, or that never had any. Obviously, I could not enumerate and discuss all these details without swamping my central thesis, which is that the biological foundations of society, solid and relatively permanent, must be safeguarded carefully at the time that this top-hamper is being cleared away.

Most adults have a pretty good idea of what the family now is, and I have therefore dealt with that topic only incidentally. It can be understood best in the light of its historical development, and there are fortunately some excellent works on this—not only monumental ones like those of Edward Westermarck, Ch. Letour-

neau, and G. E. Howard, but others better suited to popular consumption, such as that of Willystine Goodsell.

Part I is a review of some well-known facts concerning what the family ought to be; or, to use the language of biology, it is an examination of conditions which exist when the institution is adapted most effectively to human nature and to the progress of evolution.

When one inquires what, in modern civilization, is a normal family, it must be recognized that each will answer according to his point of view, and that the definitions given by the lawyer, the clergyman, the department store advertiser, the politician, the physician, the census enumerator, the poet, and the evolutionist, will differ notably.

From the biological point of view adopted in this book, the normal family may be defined briefly as one in which two adults live together happily and give birth to an appropriate number of healthy and intelligent children, whom they bring up to lives of usefulness.

It is not possible to specify the number of children that make up a normal family, except by the use of a sliding scale. I shall point out that, on the average, four children from each marriage are necessary merely to keep the population from decreasing. This figure therefore represents the minimum in good stock; but, as I shall further show, a normal family in superior stock should contain more children than this; while in inferior stock fewer children are called for. Where both parents are defective, there should be no children at all, and yet the family may be called normal with relation to the germinal character of the adults who compose it.

Part II goes on to consider some of the obstacles to the normal functioning of the family—particularly those that are more or less biological in character. Part III takes up in a more general way the question of how society can make the family what it ought to be.

In a book of this type, it is not possible, perhaps even not desirable, altogether to avoid seeming dogmatic. If an author should

discuss fully every debatable point, and set forth adequately the evidence on which he has reached each of his conclusions, he would produce a chaotic encyclopedia that would attract readers as little as it would publishers. In this instance, the subject is fortunately one on which there is no lack of public discussion, and on most phases of it every reader will have at least some ideas of his own. He may compare these with mine, and hold to those that suit him best. In any case it will be clear, I hope, that I am less interested in enforcing any particular conclusion, than in having the family studied more generally from a biological point of view.

I have thought it more useful to outline the general principles involved, than to risk bewildering the reader by piling up statistics or narrating series of individual cases. My belief is that, to a large degree, the difficulties in which the family now finds itself are due precisely to the fact that isolated and individual cases have been multiplied and held up to astonish the public, until sight has been lost of the broad underlying facts and principles.

I have no short-cuts to suggest, no panaceas to offer, not even exact, final solutions,—for there are none. The causes of the trouble in which the American family is now involved can be reached only by a thoroughgoing analysis, and they can be removed only by innumerable readjustments. Back of everything else is the need of education.

My discussion is based on the existing social and economic organization of society. Undoubtedly this organization will undergo some change, as everything else does, in the future, but it would be quite out of the field of this book to speculate on that point. If the United States should abandon the regime of private property and competition, and convert itself into a coöperative commonwealth, or a dictatorship of a superman, or a dictatorship of the proletariat, some details of this discussion of home life would have to be changed, but I believe that the broad principles would remain unaltered. But as the present book is tied to reality, it could not well proceed on any other basis than that of society as it now exists. Many writers have undertaken to describe what a family would be under one of the Utopias, and there is no objec-

tion to such an exercise of the imagination; but one of my objects in this book is to show that it is not necessary to await the creation of a Utopia, to have a satisfactory family life; that it can just as well be had here and now, with relatively little effort, if people really want it.

The family is, in fact, the oldest institution in existence. So far as one can guess intelligently, it has changed surprisingly little in 500,000 years. Often called the foundation of society, it justifies this name by the contributions it makes to (1) the perpetuation of the race, (2) the security of the state, (3) the happiness of the individual, (4) the education of the population, and by economic, social, religious, psychological, hygienic, esthetic, and other contributions that have varied with different ages but are always important.

In the face of all this, it might seem that the family is the one indispensable institution without which civilization can not proceed; and in the face of its history, it would be surprising if the changes in the form of civilization during the last four or five generations had so altered the human race as to make the family no longer a necessary institution.

Compared with the family, all other social and economic institutions are recent. None of them has been subjected to experiment and selection, none of them has been validated by the results of this experiment and selection, to anything like the same degree that the family has. The monogamous family may therefore be expected, *a priori*, to be much more stable and permanent than any other existing human institution.

I. TYPE OF MATING

What type of mating works best? There are plenty of types to choose from, not only in history, but in every-day life. It is no exaggeration to say that every conceivable form of human mating has been tried at one time or another, by some part of the human race.

The fact that there are approximately equal numbers of boys and girls born points to monogamy as the "natural state" of mankind and also makes it improbable that men are, as is often alleged, polygamous by nature while women are monogamous.

A thorough examination of all forms of mating from the evolutionary point of view would be tedious and unnecessary here, but it will be worth while to consider briefly some of the more important, which I will classify loosely under four heads as (1) promiscuity, (2) free love, (3) polygamy, and (4) monogamy.

PROMISCUITY

1. Although some earlier writers imagined a state of primitive society in which mankind lived as a promiscuous horde, with no family organization of any kind, children being cared for by the group as a whole, it is now generally agreed that such a picture has no basis in fact. There is not now and so far as history discloses there never has been any tribe which lived in such a manner.

Even the higher anthropoid apes have a more or less monogamous family, which lasts beyond the time needed for the offspring to become self-supporting. Sometimes, it appears, this is varied by polygamy, one male having two or more females. If any inference at all is justified, concerning the "original" state of man at the time he emerged from apehood, one might suppose that it was something like that now found among the anthropoids.

The rudest and least progressive savage peoples at the present time are not promiscuous but, on the contrary, much more nearly

monogamous than are many tribes somewhat higher in culture (John M. Cooper). From this and other evidence it has been inferred with some plausibility that the "original" custom of mankind was a more or less close approach to monogamy; that this tended to break down to some extent as an increase in civilization began to interfere with the natural operation of the human instincts (although monogamy has been the standard of at least the bulk of the population in all historic times); and that, with a further increase in civilization, marriage customs tend to swing back to a stricter monogamy, as at present.

Not only is there no evidence that any people has ever been wholly promiscuous, but there is presumptive evidence against the success of any such experiment. It seems likely that such a state of affairs would be so favorable to the spread of venereal diseases as to exterminate the population, by sterility or death. If venereal diseases were not in existence, the almost continual pregnancy of all females, without any feeling of individual responsibility for their care on the part of the males, would impose a severe handicap on the tribe; while if this pregnancy were avoided by abortion, as it is in some peoples, disease and sterility would be likely to spread widely. In any case, the tribe would be at a disadvantage in competing with any neighbors who had a better social organization, and would therefore tend to disappear.

It is scarcely necessary, however, to speculate on the results of a system of general promiscuity, since it has never been known to occur among men.

Indeed, promiscuity is by no means universal even among the lower animals. Some sort of a family (either monogamous or polygamous) that lasts at least beyond the time of mating is found among whales, seals, hippopotami, many of the deer family, squirrels and some other rodents, and a few carnivora, not to mention monkeys. Among birds, life-long monogamy is the rule (with a few exceptions); some birds will not even take another mate if the first one dies. These facts have no direct bearing on man's case, but they do show that some sort of family life has been found advantageous under a variety of different circumstances,

in the animal world, and that the family is, therefore, no mere recent and "artificial" invention of the human race.

FREE LOVE

2. A modification of promiscuity is the theory, held in manifold forms and designated by various polite and impolite names, which is best known under the title "free love."

The distinction between free love and promiscuity can not be drawn sharply, but the theoretical difference is that promiscuity represents a sexual union without any lasting community of mutual interest, a mere satisfaction of passion; while free love represents the union of two persons who are attracted to each other by broader personal interests, and who wish to live together so long as mutual affection exists, but no longer.

As in religion, each advocate of free love has his own particular cult, and it is difficult to group these for examination, but a large part of the views of free-lovers can be comprehended under the title given in Europe of "The New Morality," the argument of which is that sexual relations are a personal matter, of no public concern, so long as they represent the mutual desire of the partners and do not end in the birth of undesired children.

It would be hard to tell a bigger falsehood in so few words. The emotional forces tied to sex are so great that mating affects not only the two persons involved but, it might be said fairly, everyone else. Countless lives have been ruined, armies raised, peoples set against each other in war, cities pillaged and burned, and nations destroyed as the result of this temporary relationship between man and woman which seems, at the moment, so exclusively personal.

In view of the emotional forces tied to it, and their possible consequences, the relationship is always of direct concern to the relatives and friends of the two persons who enter into it. It is also of concern to the state in a variety of ways.

If it results in progeny, the state's interest is obvious.

If it does not result in progeny, the state's interest is different, but none the less keen. The question must then be answered,

why is it not resulting in progeny? Are the emotional forces involved being employed to foster a family life, with its feelings of responsibility and altruism? Or are they being turned into individualistic, anti-social channels?

The keynote of relationship between the sexes is here being struck. Is it a purely selfish keynote? If so, and if that keynote is widely imitated, it will be hard to get an unselfish and responsible tone maintained when and where it is wanted and needed; for in this respect it is easy to lower one's ideals, but harder to raise them. Much of the trouble of the modern family is due to nothing but the existence of this selfish keynote, developed either in irresponsible, temporary matings, or in the atmosphere which such matings have produced. To say that the state should stand idly by and express no interest in the generation of these emotional states is nonsense.

Even when applied personally rather than socially, the theory of free love at once runs afoul of two destructive snags—venereal diseases and pregnancy. The theorists therefore usually find it necessary to project their dream into the future, admitting that its full realization awaits the day when these obstacles shall have been removed by science.

Suppose, for the sake of argument, that they are removed. The theory still makes no headway, for a glance shows how spasmodic is its motive power, and how strong are the currents of human nature running against it. Such fundamental and scarcely alterable instincts or dispositions as mutual affection, parental feeling, and jealousy, will quickly drive on the rocks the ship that sets sails for this Utopia.

It is easy to inveigh against these instincts as undesirable remnants of an imperfect stage of human nature. Without passing any judgment on whether they are such or not, one may be sure that they are at least not to be cast off like the cocoon of the caterpillar, as it emerges into the higher life of the butterfly. They exist, and probably will continue to exist, for at least as long a time as they have occupied in getting implanted,—and that is a good many millions of years. In fact, they are probably much stronger

in the human species now than they were 100,000 years ago. While they continue to exist, the attempt to practice "the new morality" will continue, as it always has, to leave in its wake nothing but human happiness and inefficiency.

Abundant experience shows that in most free love matings one partner, usually the woman, is abandoned sooner or later. If this regime were the rule, the result would tend to be that a woman, after devoting the best years of her life to a man, would find herself cast aside in favor of some younger and more stimulating partner. But even while the relationship endures, it is not adequate. Mutual intercourse, even if permanent and intimate, does not bring about the most complete mutual understanding. The latter can arise only when a man and woman who are inwardly one live together, work together, create and bring up a family together, free from all need for secrecy, from all compunctions, and from the shadow of instability and separation. In the "free" intimacy, the partners usually expect constant stimulation from each other; whereas in marriage, after the first few months, no such demand is made, but the two settle down to explore the deeper recesses of each other's natures, and to enjoy social amenities and life in common, animated by a sense of mutual perfect trust and of unconditional interdependence which arises in a happy marriage after some years duration, but can not, by definition, exist in a more transient mating.

A favorite masquerade of free love is as trial marriage. Advocates of this frequently adopt an extremely unctuous attitude toward the production of children. It is a Very Serious Matter, they exclaim; it requires due preparation. It demands a harmonious home. A man and woman can not tell whether they are suited to each other, physically and mentally, until they have lived together for a time. Therefore let the state legalize temporary unions, under Birth Control auspices, with divorce by mutual consent. In this way people would practice the elements of family life, until they became skilful and wise enough to find permanent mates and establish happy homes in which flocks of radiant youngsters might grow to maturity in an atmosphere of love and efficiency.

Even a superficial analysis will show how little substance there is in this plea. I pass by the more obvious difficulties,—the impossibility of guaranteeing that a union will be childless, except by recourse to the abortionist; and the difficulty of dissolving the union by “mutual consent,” which usually means the callous abandonment of one by the other. To make the question diagrammatically simple, suppose either (a) that the two persons involved take their relationship seriously, or else (b) that they do not.

(a) If they take it seriously, if it represents to them a deep and peculiar emotional experience, then it is clear that it can not be terminated without producing corresponding effects on their personalities. Many people who have been through the divorce mill make good husbands or wives in a second mating, but he is a bold advocate who will attempt to prove that *because of* having been a partner in a broken home, they are able to put more happiness into, and take more happiness out of, a new marriage than is the man or woman who goes to a mate without any scars, any disillusionments, without the mental conflicts, the injury to self-esteem, the pessimism, and the bitter memories, that are a natural result of life for some time under the most intimate circumstances with a mate who was unworthy.

(b) If, on the other hand, they do not take it seriously, if it represents to them a mere search for thrills, a selfish and casual episode, then it is obvious that it reveals a deficient education, a shallow character, which further indulgence will make still more shallow and defective, and which is a disastrous preparation for permanent and happy family life. Far from encouraging such persons to continue in this direction, society should make it as difficult as possible for them to do so.

The plea that experience is desirable in order to demonstrate whether the partners are physically mated is hardly worth refuting. Physical compatibility is almost wholly a matter of education. Physical abnormalities that destroy the happiness of a marriage are rare, and can be discovered by a physician's examination before marriage—it requires no free love mating to bring them to light.

In other respects a trial marriage, or a series of trial marriages,

would not be a preparation for but a handicap to successful family life thereafter. All the evils of delayed marriage (outlined in Part II, Section III) then enter in. Many of the evils of premarital incontinence (outlined in Part II, Section II), also make themselves felt. One of the best tests of the merits of a proposal of this sort is to examine the histories of the people who now practice it. Judged by that test, trial marriage is not a success.

Everything that can be said against childless free love holds good with tenfold strength if it is proposed that free love matings result in children. Free lovers sometimes represent a selected class which has no interest in children, considering the reproduction of the race a proper function of the Lower Orders or of those who are "not smart." Occasionally, when the Birth Control clinic and the abortionist have both failed them, they become almost sentimental in descanting on the Sacredness of Motherhood; but more frequently sterility due to chronic gonorrhea saves them from having to take this heroic pose. At other times, the parties start with the idea that they will not let children invade their freedom, and then one or the other awakens to the need of children, precipitating a crisis which is one of the common tragedies of free love matings.

For the sake of clearness, the problem may be viewed from a slightly different angle by inquiring, why do people want to enter into a free love union, when they could just as well marry? The reasons alleged are nearly always incomplete, and usually not the real reasons at all. But back of them all is what I believe most unprejudiced persons will admit to be the real reason, namely, the desire to avoid responsibility. If this is actually the fundamental reason that inspires a free love mating, it is evidently one which society cannot encourage. Irresponsibility is anti-social both in family life and in the other activities of existence.

A defense of free love by means of an attack on monogamy as out of date has no scientific foundation. Some writers, recognizing this, have attempted a flank attack. A good example of these is H. G. Wells. Monogamy is the standard, he admits; it is the best in general; but there may be people who find something else—

say bigamy—suits their own particular needs. These exceptional people should not be interfered with, since they get individual happiness by deviating from the standard, while their example can not possibly weaken, can not even threaten, an institution so strongly intrenched as monogamy.

This point of view, which is shared with slight variation by many a Little Group of Serious Thinkers, does not permit its occupants to see far. Once they have admitted that monogamy is the standard, they have given away their whole position, for society can not authorize any marked deviation from a necessary institution. Push the argument a little farther. There are people—plenty of them—who are so peculiarly constituted as to find their greatest individual happiness in murder, arson, incest, highway robbery, or rape. Their plea of individual happiness is not admitted. Why admit it, then, in the case of free love?

The answer offered is that those things concern others than the individual, while marriage concerns only the individual—or, more exactly, the two individuals involved. This is so superficial that it should mislead no one. Marriage usually concerns children, and it always concerns society as a whole. Few persons are able to violate well-established social customs without suffering mentally as the result. Moreover, the young, the inexperienced, the adventurous, the weak-minded are always too ready to follow an example, or to be carried away by arguments whose fallacy they can not discover until years later, after the harm has been done. An illustration of this is the girl who is taught at college that she wants a Career, and who only comes to her senses at the age of 30 or 40, realizing that she has made a tragic mistake but that it is then too late for her to remedy it by finding a home of her own.

Not many will plead for "freedom" where murder, arson, incest, rape, or robbery is concerned. But because of the emotional complexities, and the wealth of conventions (some of them obsolete) by which marriage is surrounded, some persons seem to think that anything is allowable in a discussion of matrimony. Indeed, they take the same attitude toward love that is enounced in another field of esthetics by so many contented critics: "I don't

know anything about Art, but I know what I like." It is high time that this attitude were abandoned, and the discussion of marriage kept on a scientific basis. When it is so kept, it will be seen quickly enough that promiscuity, whether dressed in its ancient and cruder or its more modern and more genteel forms, has no biological foundation.

POLYGAMY

3. Polygamy is found in two forms—polyandry, or the union of one woman with a number of men, and polygyny, or the union of one man with a number of women. Apart from prostitution, polyandry exists as a standard only in rare cases. It is obvious that a polyandrous society must decrease gradually in numbers, and probably become extinct; hence this form of mating has no permanent importance in evolution.

When one speaks of polygamy, therefore, one usually means polygyny, which, after monogamy, has been the predominant form of mating in the human species. It produces an accelerated evolution in certain directions, but examination will show that these are only in part good.

Not only is selection among women virtually non-existent, since they are in so much demand that nearly every female finds a husband; but this evil is intensified by the necessity, in most cases, of importing women from a lower group, to make up the desired number of plural wives or concubines. Thus among the Arabs the importation of Negresses into the harem has probably been an important factor in the decline of the race (Paul Popenoe, 1923). The evil is intensified still further, if there is any ground for the doubtful conclusion of A. S. Parkes and others, that polygyny tends to result in a preponderance of male births; for thus the proportion of males would increase in each generation, and make the deficit in the number of available wives still greater.

Among the men, on the other hand, there is usually a stringent selection for one quality only, namely, wealth; since the support of several wives is costly. The wealthy man can afford it; the average man must content himself with one wife, or go unmated.

The children born are therefore predominantly the offspring of wealthy fathers; this means the perpetuation of some qualities that are desirable, some that are not so.

The principal exception to this is among the poor, where women, rather than being objects of luxury, are drudges, and therefore assets. The poor man is benefitted by having as many wives as he can get, since they represent so much unpaid labor. This again does not mean the perpetuation of the most valuable racial strains.

This source of labor is not open to the man of middle class, for his wives insist on being maintained "in the style to which they are accustomed." The result is that in any polygynous society the actual proportion of men in the population who have plural wives is very small.

In Muslim countries, however, unlimited freedom of divorce at the will of the man has brought about a condition of "serial polygamy," which is by no means unknown in the United States. The man who can afford only one wife at a time can yet afford to discard her and take a new one, and he makes use of this privilege so freely that in urban communities the individual who has been married for any length of time, and who has yet had only one partner, is the exception. Men who have had 10 or 20 wives in as many years are not particularly rare.¹ It is obvious that this tends to destroy family solidarity and continuity, and leaves a situation similar to that often found in a regime of free love.

There is also a selection, particularly among young men, of the physical outlook on marriage, as opposed to what might be termed the romantic or idealistic. The man with plural wives is likely to be one who regards women as created for his convenience. The man with a higher appreciation of the personality of woman and the possibilities of happiness in marriage will take only one wife. Sometimes a woman with force of character and an enlight-

¹ Interesting light has been thrown on this point recently by Paul W. Harrison and H. St. J. B. Philby. The latter reports that up to 1920 Ibn Sa'ūd, Sultan of Najd (Central Arabia) had had more than 100 wives (together with uncounted concubines); and, as he assured the author with an anticipatory smile, he is "a young man yet!"

ened outlook on life insists that her husband (especially if, as often happens, he is also her cousin) shall neither divorce her nor bring additional wives into the harem. In both cases, these superior monogamists leave fewer children to carry on their standards than do the Solomons.

The result of these various selective factors is that polygyny tends to produce quantity rather than quality of children.

Fortunately the results can be studied in nature; one is not obliged to depend on ratiocination. In a patriarchal and militant civilization, where the number of males was kept small by warfare, polygyny seems to have worked fairly well for a limited time. But the evolution of these societies on modern lines has invariably resulted in the virtual disappearance of polygamy, so that, in Turkey, Egypt, and other Muslim countries today, it has even been or is about to be legally outlawed, and has in fact been rare for a long time.

Whatever may have been the advantages or disadvantages of polygyny in an earlier period, then, it is out of date now and needs no further consideration.

MONOGAMY

4. From what has been said, it will be evident that monogamy has, biologically, no real competitor. It represents an adaptation of the human race; it has survived and spread at the expense of other types of mating because it has been found more favorable to the needs and perpetuation of the race, and more nearly in accord with human nature, than have its competitors.

As regards its effect on individual character, the testimony is generally favorable. "The deepening of the sense of responsibility, the education of the individual in self-discipline, the development of patience and charity, the overcoming of selfishness, the preservation of the emotional life from disintegration and from subjection to passing moods—these are elements of the inner life which may be described as absolute and permanent conditions of all high social culture" and can be maintained only under monogamy, says F. W. Foerster; while Anna Garlin Spencer remarks that "it has

given man an ethical training in self-sacrificing, courageous, and persistent labor for the benefit of his group, and an institutional command of the resources of nature and of human capacity, which have proved invaluable to social progress." The selfish, cynical, superficial type of personality, that is developed under more or less promiscuous regimes, is unfavorable to the progress of civilization. Only under an enlightened monogamy can it be avoided with certainty.

Those who argue from the practice of primitive peoples overlook the fact that love is a more complex thing for civilized man than for the savage. Romantic love in particular is a relatively recent invention. Monogamy favors the exploration and development of this field, as promiscuity and polygamy do not. Observation and history show that the normal person finds full and well-rounded satisfaction of instincts (which means happiness) only in life-long communion with the object of love. The personality which falls short of this, and attempts to get satisfaction by a series of casual, selfish experiences, is nothing but a personality suffering from arrested development. It has not attained to adult stature, but has remained at the infantile level, when the whole world is valued in terms of the immediate gratification that it furnishes to one's senses. (Cf. Part II, Section IV.)

Considering the question from a wholly selfish point of view, but a different one from that described in the preceding paragraph, it is easy to see why monogamy has appealed to most men and women who have developed beyond the infantile stage. The man wishes to raise children only of his own begetting, and he desires to see the family traditions and possessions, oftentimes also his life work, continued in a secure, well-ordered way. He wants to avoid the loneliness or disquiet of bachelorhood, and at the same time it pleases him to call one woman his own and share her with no one.

Monogamy offers woman the possibility of comparable advantages, even though (like man) she sometimes fails to get them in practice. So far as the ideal of relationship is concerned, she finds that her will is recognized publicly as equal to that of the man—

she is an individual personality, and not merely an inmate of a harem, much less a commodity to be bought and sold from day to day. She has a choice in the selection of her mate, and after marriage she monopolises that mate, not having to share him with others. If the mating is for life, the man is obliged to respect her will to a much greater extent than he would if she were merely one of numerous consorts, or if he intended to abandon her shortly.

Such considerations as these, which might be much extended, explain why monogamy benefits man and woman from the narrowest, personal point of view—taking no account of many broader influences which are in fact of great importance. If promiscuity represents the expression of an irresponsible, autoerotic, infantile type of reaction, unable to see beyond a small immediate gain to a much greater but slightly more remote gain, then it is fair to say that failure to be monogamous is not the act of a normal adult, but of one whose mind has not developed properly.

As regards sexual selection, monogamy tends to favor the more substantial and permanent qualities, as against the more transient physical or financial qualities which have been found in every case to bulk large under a regime of polygamy or promiscuity.

As regards the birth-rate, monogamy apparently tends to result more nearly in the production of a normal number of children than does any other system. It is especially favorable to the net birth-rate, that is, to the survival of children born, because each of them has two parents to watch over his physical, mental, and economic needs.

As regards the quality of parenthood, there can scarcely be any serious argument. Monogamy is in a class by itself. The attention of neither husband nor wife should be distracted from the family by any overwhelming emotional experience outside of it; because children need the care of both parents. So far, in the history of the family, the public pledge of fidelity between man and woman has served better than anything else to guarantee to children upbringing in a home where their interests are given proper attention, and their minds directed along the most useful lines.

Whatever temporary or incidental defects there may be in its operation, then, there seems to be no question about the general principle involved. Monogamy, when examined from a biological point of view, without regard to prejudices or conventions, is found to be the only type of mating suitable to modern mankind.

II. CHOICE OF A MATE

Improvement in the selection of mates will probably do more than any other one thing for the conservation of the family.

It is popularly supposed in some circles that "falling in love" is capricious and determined by chance or some mystical force against which it is useless for human beings to struggle. Such a theory serves the purpose of romancers, but anyone who considers the question soberly can testify that marriage, at least, is usually preceded by a good deal of careful consideration on the part of both partners.

Broadly, it has been shown by many students that people are attracted to each other by unlikeness in sexual traits and likeness in all other traits.

It is the latter that makes largely for compatibility, and the basis of it exists to some extent even under the continental system, where marriages are arranged largely by the parents of the young people; and in the oriental system, where the bride and groom never see each other until after they are married. The relatives in each case try to pick out a mate who is "suitable," that is, of similar rank and wealth, and this very fact tends to give the young people a common background which makes for harmony and compatibility as they later become acquainted with each other.

Much more can be done, however, through education of the young people themselves. The qualities desirable in mating may be divided into two groups, according as they refer primarily to the mutual relations of husband and wife, or to the endowment of their offspring.

PERSONAL CONSIDERATIONS

Of particular traits that may be mentioned, age is generally first thought of. Everyone agrees that the husband should be a little,

though not too much, older than his wife. Too great discrepancy in this respect is not only unphysiological, but interferes with the feeling of perfect comradeship that should exist in a marriage.

In most cases the reproductive system matures between the twelfth and sixteenth years of life, and in the narrowest sense young people are ready for marriage any time thereafter. But it is not at all desirable that marriage take place until after physical development as a whole has been largely completed. Among white Americans, this occurs somewhere between the ages of 18 and 21, in most cases. Mental development is still slower, and requires five or six years longer to reach its term.

Other considerations agreeing, young people should marry soon after they complete their physical development, and before they complete their mental development. If marriage is delayed until the latter is closed, it commonly finds both personalities set in their ways, with a large stock of habits, and moving in a rut. They do not fit so well into married life, which requires a continual give and take—especially give.

Imaginary evils of early marriage are delineated so often that it is worth while to look at the biological facts for a moment. From a eugenic point of view, early marriage in good stock is advantageous not only because the generations come closer together, but because the fertility of women is greatest, shortly after the maturity of the reproductive system. The younger the wife at marriage, the smaller the percentage of wives who bear no children, and the larger the size of family. This holds good in the white race down to about the age of 15. G. D. Maynard, studying the New Zealand birth statistics, found that "if fecundity be measured by the percentage of women who bear children within 24 months after marriage, the age of maximum fecundity for New Zealand wives lies probably between the ages of 15 and 20"; while in England the largest family seemed to be associated with marriage at 16, in Scotland at 18.

Obstetricians have long observed that childbirth among young mothers is particularly easy and safe. A detailed study by John W. Harris, of the records of 160 white and 340 Negro mothers at

Johns Hopkins Hospital, all between the ages of 12 and 16, and bearing their first child in every case, led him to write:

Based upon the study of 500 patients comprised in this report, it seems permissible to conclude that pregnancy and labor are attended by no greater danger to the young primipara than to older women. On the other hand, the duration of labor is actually shorter. As our figures show that the size of the children is not inferior to that noted in older women, and that abnormal pelves occur quite as frequently,¹ this result must be attributed to the greater elasticity of the soft parts. Consequently, speaking from a purely obstetrical point of view, the ages under consideration appear to be the optimum time for occurrence of first labor.

All this is not an argument for child marriage. The facts are presented merely to show that, physiologically, early marriage and childbearing are in many respects favorable to mother and child. Of course, the physiological considerations are by no means the only ones that count. Education can not be ignored.

But education and other social factors must not be stressed to the point that the fundamental biological factors are ignored. From the latter point of view, it must be recognized that relatively early marriage (say any time after 18 for women and 21 for men) is advantageous.

In both sexes, early marriage tends to remove the strain on the emotions which is imposed by a long period of celibacy, and which often results in damage to the personality. But it is particularly important to women—so much so that it is little less than a crime to advise girls to wait until they are 30 or more to marry, in order to enjoy life more fully, get a better preparation, or what not.

Early marriage gives a girl a wider choice of mates. It results in early and less painful childbearing, with fewer stillbirths and miscarriages, more breast-fed infants, and fewer infant deaths. It is more likely to produce children that are vigorous, long-lived, and intelligent. It allows parents to space their children at reasonable distances and still have a family of normal size without exhaustion of the mother. It is advantageous to the education of

¹ This means merely that "the white girl of 13 to 16 years has as large a pelvis as her older sister."

the children in the home. Finally, early marriage is normally favorable to the vigor and longevity of the mother herself.

Early marriage is natural, and most young people would marry early if they were left alone, and enabled to do so. But a man must support his wife: this means a paying job first, and this may not be reached for some years—if ever. Then there is the distraction of other interests and pursuits. Finally, there is wrong advice, of which women are the greatest victims, since they pay a heavier penalty for delaying marriage than do men.

Parents do their daughters a great disservice when they seize upon some trivial talent which the girl possesses, as for music, and urge her to prepare herself for a musical career, rather than for marriage. There is probably not one such case in a hundred where the advice is really justified; but the girl, misled by the vanity of her parents, and the praise of incompetent teachers who want a pupil (the percentage of inefficiency probably being greater among music teachers than in any other branch of the teaching profession), spends great amounts of time and money in training, only to find later that there is no career for her, or, if there is, that she would have preferred a family. If such girls were encouraged to prepare for family life, in the first place, and at the same time to develop their talents for their own pleasure and that of their friends, many a broken heart would be avoided.

Race, health, beauty, and education are among the other traits most frequently called to mind, and so often discussed as to require no further comment here. Financial and social position almost always play a part in the selection of a mate, and while they may be given too much weight, it is inaccurate to protest against them as interferences with good mating. As Roswell H. Johnson has shown (1921), they form one of the most available rough-and-ready measurements of the real value of a family.

EUGENIC CONSIDERATIONS

Other matters of personal importance will occur to every reader, for they loom large in all discussions of marriage. The traits that are primarily of importance to the children are not quite so often considered. They may be summed up as good ancestry.

This should include a good average of both physical and mental traits. Health, fertility, vigor, and longevity are most to be desired on the physical side; on the mental side general intelligence, self-control, energy, efficiency, usefulness, and altruism.

It is necessary to emphasize the average of the ancestry, because young people frequently make the mistake of being swayed by a few outstanding traits, either good or bad. The average is much more significant. Descent from some great but remote ancestor is of little value compared with a high average among uncles and aunts.

In addition to the foregoing, it is of course important that the young people have an intelligent idea of what marriage means, and what its duties and privileges are; that they be educated for parenthood; and that they have enough money to make a start.

III. SOCIAL SANCTIONS

While the state should interfere with lovers as little as possible, it is necessary that every mating be (1) restricted, (2) pre-announced, and (3) recorded. None of these precautions will in any way infringe the rights and legitimate privileges of any man or woman. If any of them is omitted, society will to that extent lack needful protection.

RESTRICTIONS ON MARRIAGE

1. Marriage must be safeguarded by prohibiting it to certain classes of people whose mating would result in far more harm to society than benefit to themselves. Certain restrictions have long been enforced; a few others should be established. Among the restrictions of most interest are:

(a) Age. Probably few personal interests would be injured if the limit were placed at 21 for men and 18 for women. People who are not old enough to vote or to exercise the other rights of adult life can scarcely be considered old enough to undertake the delicate and difficult responsibilities of matrimony.

Such a restriction would have a eugenic value, in tending to equalize the birth rate in the more capable and less capable parts of the population. At present the necessity of getting an education or a start in business prevents most superior young men (and therefore most superior young women) from marrying before 25, while among the poor and shiftless marriage makes little difference, and can be undertaken years earlier than this without inconvenience. The result is early marriage and larger families among a part of the population where these extra children are not needed. If they were restrained until 21 and 18, the superior part of the population would start more nearly even with them.

When it is recalled that there are in the United States at the present time more than 600,000 husbands or wives less than 16

years old (Fred S. Hall and Mary E. Richmond), it will be evident that any attempt to raise the legal age of marriage to 18 and 21 would be revolutionary and disastrous. Many states still retain the old common law standard of 12 years for girls and 14 for boys. Undue haste to change this legislation is almost certain to mean an increase of juvenile delinquency, illegitimacy, promiscuity, and abortion. But if public opinion generally accepts the desirability of changes which will bring about earlier marriage among the educated and later marriage among the uneducated, a gradual improvement can be brought about, which can be registered from time to time by a slight raise of the legal age, if circumstances permit.

(b) Consanguinity, in the nearer degrees, is generally considered a bar to marriage. One-third of the states of the union prohibit the marriage of first cousins, Oklahoma extends the restriction to second cousins. Biologically such a restriction is not justified, and its universal enforcement would have deprived the world of much talent. There is no longer any mystery about this matter. The marriage of relatives merely means that the mates have, to a greater extent than usual, the same inherited traits. Their children therefore get a double dose of these traits. If the traits are good the offspring are better, while if the traits are bad the children are naturally handicapped to an unusual extent. From a strictly biological point of view, then, cousin marriages might be commended in good families and condemned in defective stock.

The argument against such marriages must be made on other grounds than the genetic. It is obvious, for instance that two young people are likely to be better off if they have the advice, influence, and support of two family circles back of them, rather than merely of the single one in which they grew up together. And it is clear that the love which binds the members of a family together is not the same as that which joins mates for life: the two ought not to be confused, and it is therefore desirable that thoughts of mating should not arise in the minds of close relatives.

Such reasons as these are good arguments against cousin mar-

riage, but they scarcely justify any legal interference. The existing laws against cousin marriage should be abolished.

(c) Mental defects. Insanity has always been a bar to marriage, because of the legal principle that an insane person is not competent to enter into a contract. The biological reasons against such a marriage are equally weighty, to say the least; and there is a tendency nowadays to extend the restriction to include the feeble-minded.

This is a step in the right direction, but it immediately involves the difficulty of telling who is feeble-minded. The term is a relative one, and it is not always easy to draw the line, especially in border-line cases. The difficulty is all the greater in those states where the question must be legally determined, not by experts, but by a jury of 12 men who may be "good and true" but who certainly know nothing about the subject.

It is highly desirable to prevent the feeble-minded from marrying, or at least from bearing children, but it is doubtful if legal restrictions on marriage are likely to accomplish much at the present time. More is to be expected from education of the public, from segregation of the feeble-minded, or from putting them in charge of responsible relatives with the understanding that they are not to mate unless previously sterilized.

In any case it is even more desirable to keep down the birth-rate in the large part of the population that is mentally "low grade," than to prevent the obviously feeble-minded from marrying; for the greater part of mental defect comes from the former class of matings. There is an appalling amount of feeble-mindedness lying concealed ("recessive") in the germ-plasm of people who possess intelligence that seems to be normal. The number of these "carriers" in the population is much greater than the number of persons who are frankly feeble-minded or imbecile. Whenever two of these carriers marry each other, some of their children are likely to be feeble-minded. So even if all the recognized feeble-minded were prevented from reproducing, for a number of generations, an abundant new crop of feeble-minded children would be produced each year from the seemingly normal parents who are carriers

of the recessive defect. The real problem of society is therefore to lessen the reproduction of all the inefficient or less intelligent strata of the population, while at the same time striving greatly to increase the reproduction of the most efficient and highly endowed part.

In some states epilepsy has been made a bar to marriage, but this is a term that means a good many different things, none of them fully understood, and it is doubtful whether legal prohibitions can be of much avail at present except in extreme cases where they are scarcely needed.

(d) Physical defects usually taken into account in marriage consist of a few infectious diseases. Impotence is regarded as ground for annulment rather than for prohibition of marriage, the theory no doubt being that this condition (like sterility) can only become known after marriage has been consummated. Congenitally deaf, dumb, or blind should not have children in marriage, unless they have extraordinary counterbalancing qualities.

Venereal infections and, in a few states, tuberculosis, are the diseases most taken into account. As they stand on a different footing, I shall consider them separately, beginning with the latter.

Broadly speaking, one who is tuberculous ought not to marry; and one ought not to marry a tuberculous person. But to forbid the marriage of all such would be to prevent a very considerable part of society from mating. Many of these persons will be cured, many will avoid having children, others may have such superior traits as to outweigh the defect. Moreover, a tuberculous person is little more likely to infect others—even his wife—if married than if not married. Hence at the present time it is not feasible to forbid marriage of the tuberculous. An intensification of the educational campaign, to lead people for the sake of posterity voluntarily to avoid such marriage, and to realize the desirability of mating in sound stocks, is all that can be demanded.

Syphilis and gonorrhea are in a different category, because of their higher infectiousness and the practical certainty of communication to a mate. There is every reason why no one infected with a venereal disease should be permitted to wed. The question is merely one of means to be used to make the prohibition effective.

Many states have attempted to reach this goal either by requiring the applicants for a marriage license to swear that they are not infected with venereal diseases, or by making the man present a certificate showing that he has been examined by a physician and found to be free from such diseases.

The obstacles interfering with the complete success of such a law as this are serious. In the first place, denial of a license will not always prevent mating, for the class of people infected with venereal diseases is not the most responsible and high-minded class in the community. In the second place, the measure comes too late to prevent all cases of infection, for a person with syphilis in some stages can infect another merely by kissing or by drinking out of the same cup: therefore freedom from syphilis ought to be assured before two people become engaged. In the third place, it is practically impossible for even a specialist to certify, after a prolonged and expensive examination, that a given person is free from syphilis or gonorrhea, and it is therefore out of the question for the average physician, in a hasty \$3 examination, to assert such freedom. Moreover, there will always be found incompetent and dishonest doctors who will give worthless certificates. Finally, from a scientific point of view the examination ought to apply to women as well as men, but this is repugnant to public sentiment, particularly since in many towns there are no women physicians available to make the examinations for their own sex.

All these and other obstacles, coupled with the indifference or hostility of a large part of the medical profession, have interfered seriously with the enforcement of such measures in the states that now have them. The educational result, in arousing the public to the seriousness of venereal diseases, and their particular menace to the family, is good. On the other hand, an examination, incorrectly or fraudulently reporting a man to be uninfected, may give his bride a false sense of security.

Many people, arguing that no law is ever 100 per cent enforced, believe that on the whole these medical certificate laws are a gain—that they are much better than nothing. But the ideal toward which reformers should look is an enlightened public senti-

ment which will lead every person, male or female, who is about to marry, to have a thorough physical examination, and at the same time receive such instruction as may fit his or her own case. Cases differ so that it is impossible for any blanket legislation to fit them all.

PUBLISHING THE BANNS

2. So much for the principal ways in which marriage is or should be restricted. In addition to such precautions, it should be published in advance, to prevent hasty, secret, and ill-considered marriages.

What is needed here is a revival of the old custom of publishing the banns. If every application were posted two weeks before a marriage license is issued, few legitimate interests would be menaced and a large proportion of undesirable marriages would be prevented. Friends and relatives, public sentiment, or sobering-up would come to the rescue, and a proposed match be abandoned which, if carried through secretly, as it now may be, would end only in misery and divorce. Such a measure is now being adopted by many states.

COMMON LAW MARRIAGE

3. Marriages must not only be restricted and pre-announced, but they must also be recorded. This means simply the abolition of that American anomaly, the common law marriage.

In one-half of the States, a man and woman can contract a legal marriage—as binding as any other—without license, ceremony, or publicity of any kind, simply by agreeing with each other that they will henceforth be man and wife. The agreement need not even be in writing—a telephone conversation is sufficient! In some states they need not ever have lived together—perhaps they would not need even to have seen each other. A famous case concerns a man in Minnesota who signed a marriage contract in duplicate and sent the two copies to a woman in Missouri. She signed them and returned one copy to him. The man was shortly afterward killed in a railway accident and the woman, who had never

lived with him, sued for damages, which she got, as widow of the deceased. Another type is represented by cases where a man picks up a prostitute on the street, takes her to a hotel, and registers her as his wife. On the basis of this "public declaration" it may be possible for her to sue for the establishment of her legal rights as his wife, and get a jury to give them to her. One need not sympathize with the man in such a position and yet realize that the result tends to degrade the institution of marriage.

It is obvious that if the state is going to exercise any control at all over marriage, it can not afford to leave such a loophole as this. The fact that common law marriage benefits only people who, on the average, represent the least desirable part of the community, is all the more reason why the custom should be abolished. The people who practice common law marriage are those who should be under the greatest control, not under the least control or none at all.

The United States is the only civilized country where common law marriage is now tolerated. A remnant of old English common law, it has been abolished in England since 1753. It became established in American law, as Otto E. Koegel has shown, through indifference and ignorance, almost by accident. The American Bar Association and virtually all students of the question have pronounced in favor of its abolition. Public sentiment should demand that the legislatures of all states where it still lingers wipe it out of existence.

Some other forms of marriage are open to one of the great objections against the common law marriage, namely, its lack of solemnity. There is a real advantage in a formal ceremonial which makes people realize that a wedding is something different from every-day life. The church ritual justifies itself here. The ordinary office of a justice of the peace, decorated with spittoons, cigar stubs, constables, and loafers, is not a suitable place for a wedding. The state should provide a dignified hall in the county court house, and designate a suitable jurist, for the increasing number of people who are not married in their own homes or in a church—even if their ceremony consists, as it may in some states, of nothing more than the signature of a civil contract.

IV. REPRODUCTION

It is unnecessary to argue that the normal family consists not merely of mates, but of parents and children. The family has meant that, since the beginning of time; normal mates are not satisfied unless they have children; and a community made up of mates without children would become extinct in short order. The family did not create children: children created the family. Among lower animals, a home and family are found only when they are necessary, which commonly means for a short time. Among human beings, with almost infinitely higher mental capacity, the home and family exist for the duration of life because they are necessary throughout life.

It is worth while, however, to recognize that under certain conditions a childless family, though not normal, may yet be approvable. If, for instance, there is some reason, as inherited defect, why two people should not have children, yet they love each other, it is better for them to marry than to remain single, for they thus increase their own happiness, and probably that of others, without injuring society.

Apart from such exceptional cases, a normal family is certainly one that includes children. The latter may be considered both as to quantity and as to quality.

The number of children in a family must be regarded both from the point of view of the parents, and that of society.

QUANTITY IN CHILDREN

Society is interested first of all in perpetuation; suicide is as abnormal for a race as for an individual. It has been shown repeatedly by statisticians that an average of about four children per family is necessary to keep a population even stationary in numbers, without providing for any increase.

It might at first sight be supposed that if each married couple

produced two children to replace themselves, the population would be kept up; but a moment's thought will show that this is not true, because these two children can not be depended on to grow up, marry, and produce two more children in turn. Some will die before marriage, or before their marriage has been fruitful; others never marry; still others marry but for one reason or another have no children. To allow for such conditions, it has been found that an average couple must bear four children or bring three to maturity; and these are therefore the basic figures in any consideration of a normal family.

But it must never be forgotten that they are merely averages. The interests of society are best fostered if it is made up of families of more than four children among the superior part of the population, and of less than four in the inferior part, ranging down to no children at all among the defectives and genuine undesirables.

How does this statement of quantity compare with the interests of the parents themselves? Not well, it might seem at first glance, for it is notorious that the prosperous, efficient, and useful families of the nation are frequently smaller than that, while among the poor, shiftless, and feebleminded, large families are all too common, to their own distress as well as to that of the commonwealth. "The people in big houses have small families; the people in small houses have big families."

ADVANTAGES OF LARGE FAMILIES

Both these conditions will be considered later. Here it is only necessary to point out that, from a biological point of view, it is to the interest of superior parents themselves to have four or more children. The reasons—and they are often strong ones—which have discouraged childbearing in this class, and have made the two-child family, or even the only child, seem desirable, are not biological, but matters of finance, ambition, social aspiration, and convenience.

Among the biological reasons against small families, and in favor of a family of four or more children, are such as the following:

- a. A healthy woman is benefited by repeated pregnancies.

Her system is organized for that purpose, and it finds full expression of its potentialities, and corresponding full degree of well-being, only in repeated pregnancies.

b. The inherent quality of the children is better in such families. The first-born commonly starts with a slight handicap—he is lighter in weight and shorter in length, at birth, and this is apparently reflected in his subsequent life. He is, for instance, not so long-lived, on the average, as are the three or four children who follow him. If the family is limited to one or two children, it is made up of first-borns from 50 to 100 per cent, while in the larger family the percentage of later-than-first is higher.

c. The education of the children is better. The character of the “only child” is proverbial, and the proverb is too often justified. In a larger family, the children have normal contacts with their brothers and sisters: not only do they benefit, but their influence on their parents is better than is that of an only child. Normal parents under favorable circumstances will derive much more pleasure and satisfaction from four children than from two.

d. The parents of a large family have a greater chance of giving birth to a particularly talented child, than have the parents of a small family—other considerations agreeing, of course. As the inherited units are distributed by chance, the situation resembles that in a lottery. The more tickets, or children, one has, the greater the likelihood of drawing a capital prize.

As to quantity, then, there is no antagonism between the biological interests of the parents and of society. In both cases a family of four or more children is desirable, and the small family is harmful, in superior stock.

QUALITY IN CHILDREN

As to quality, the interests of the two are always in complete agreement, both parents and society desiring that every child be as good a child as possible.

An opposite view has been maintained sometimes: it has been charged that some societies, or a dominant part of some societies, cared little about the quality of the children born, but wanted

abundant quantity for industrial exploitation or military aggression—wanted mere cannon fodder, in short, instead of good citizens.

It is doubtful if such a view has ever been maintained seriously in responsible quarters. It is true that many writers on population have shown little concern as to quality, but this is usually because they did not appreciate sufficiently the extent and importance of inherent differences among children. They tended to believe that all children are created equal, and that nothing more is necessary than good education to produce good citizens in abundance.

Such a view is entirely out of harmony with the facts, and is rapidly becoming obsolete. And if anyone has actually thought that quantity, without regard to quality, was a desirable aim in population, he was wholly wrong. A high average quality of population has never been anything but a benefit to a country, whereas a large quantity, with low quality, has in the long run never been anything but a handicap, even in new and undeveloped countries where quantity is most desirable.

This brief and summary discussion of an immense problem is perhaps sufficient to establish the only point it was intended to establish: namely, that the normal family, as here considered, will average four children, running higher than this in the superior part of the population and lower in the inferior part.

V. INFLUENCE

A normal family must promote the welfare of father, mother, and children. If it does so, it will also benefit society as a whole.

INFLUENCE ON MEN

1. The evolution of the family during hundreds of thousands of years has been toward binding the father closer to the mother and child. It may be assumed, therefore, that he is now reasonably well adjusted to the home, and that its influence on him and his influence on it will be, on the whole, favorable.

This assumption is borne out by an examination of the facts. I believe it is safe to say that men desire marriage and a home (including children) as much as women do, if not more; that they get as much satisfaction out of their home life as do their wives, if not more; and that home life exerts as much steadying and inspiring influence on them as it does on women, if not more.

This is not to say that any man fits perfectly into his home, or does his full duty by it—any more than any woman. But the changes have been rung so often on that excellent motto, "What is home without a mother," and the man in the case has been so often pushed into the background, that it is worth while to emphasize, occasionally, the fact that a husband and a father is part of a family; that in most respects he comes fully as near, on the average, to contributing his share as does any other part of the family; and that the personal benefits he derives from it in the shape of greater comfort, stimulus to ambition, comradeship, satisfaction in his children, and the like, are fully recognized by the average man.

So far as he is concerned, the changes necessary to make the family life influence his happiness and productivity more favorably are mainly such educational changes as will make family life in general more harmonious, will perpetuate love between the mates;

and particularly such economic changes as will enable him to establish and care for his family without excessive sacrifices.

On the other hand, most fathers need better education to fulfill all their duties within the home. Nearly all of them need to give more time to their wives and children, and to assume a larger share of responsibility for the details of child training. Other delinquencies of the father, such as the economic (many men tend to make their wives dependents, either by parsimony or by indulgence) are rather too remote from the biologic field to be considered in this brief summary.

INFLUENCE ON WOMEN

It is the woman, more often than the man, who complains of marriage; who finds herself dissatisfied and disillusioned. In most communities, four out of every five divorces are sought by women. Frequently, her revolt is due to wrong education, to lack of sufficient occupation of the right kind, and to the agitation of mismated wives and disappointed spinsters.

Frequently dissatisfaction is due to the failure of a well-intentioned but ill-educated husband to understand his wife's nature; or her failure to understand her own.

Sometimes, on the other hand, woman is entitled to complain justly that home life becomes for her an imprisonment, in which she is cut off from contact with almost everything worth while in the world and condemned to spend her years in menial labor, unrewarded and even unrecognized.

In so far as such a condition really exists, it is often her own fault as much as that of any one else, and due to a wrong point of view, an easy acceptance of the line of least resistance, and lack of imagination or ambition to step out of the rut. An education of young women which prepared them better for motherhood, which inculcated a more scientific attitude toward the home, and which made them more efficient in the discharge of their domestic duties, and better able to see the fallacies in the propaganda of home-breakers, and which showed them how to take a larger part (though not by a "career") in the cultural and expressive opportunities of life, would do more than anything else to remove the sources of irritation.

In short, a large part of the complaint made by women regarding home influence is due to wrong education and surroundings. But there is enough legitimate ground for complaint to demand improvements in the education of men, as well as of the women themselves. Finally, every reorganization and improvement in society that tends to make domestic life simpler and less burdensome, and frees for more productive uses the time of such women as are now actually absorbed to a large extent by unproductive labor, may be advantageous.

INFLUENCE ON CHILDREN

3. The importance of the influence of the child on the home, and the home on the child, does not lack recognition. Sometimes, indeed, there is a sentimental halo cast over the whole relationship. This is intensified by the fact that perhaps not one woman in a hundred is prepared effectively for motherhood, and some of the other 99 tend to assume that "instinct" furnishes them all the training and equipment necessary and that "mother love" is an adequate substitute for knowledge and efficiency.

As the fact has become more generally realized during the last few decades, that a child's personality is largely formed during the first five years, and quite definitely in the first two years, of his life, the home has not lacked assailants as well as defenders. It has been accused, and often justly, of exercising a cramping and deforming influence on the child's emotional life, of teaching him to be subservient to authority, whether right or wrong, and of laying the bases of complexes that may work out disastrously in future years, when they are quite forgotten and unsuspected.

Among the dangers to which the child is exposed are, first, lack of love, and secondly, unwisely directed love.

Disharmony in the family life gives the infant a background which it can never outgrow. It starts him with an equipment of fundamental antagonisms and feelings of inferiority which color his whole future emotional life.

Unwisely directed love produces not only the unpleasantly familiar "spoiled child," but the child with a mother-complex

or a father-complex. The affections are imbedded so tenaciously in a parent (usually the one of the opposite sex) that its personality is unable to free itself at the customary time—the age of adolescence—and the child goes through life with its emotions still fixed in an infantile way on its parent. The result is either failure to marry, or failure to find happiness in marriage.

Such dangers have led some people to argue that children would be better brought up if they were taken away from their parents soon after birth and entrusted to the impersonal justice and scientific attentions of a state-managed institution. J.-J. Rousseau, the great apostle of individualism and natural education in the eighteenth century, sent all his own children to a foundling asylum and never knew what became of them. Probably few persons adopt this view as a matter of conviction. If they do, a study of America's 1400 orphan asylums, containing some 150,000 children (half of whom have both parents living), will make clear that no brooder can supply the intimate contacts which form a child's personality, and which it finds only in its own home. Every child needs a little love. A recent study of foster children by the New York State Charities Aid Association leads its authors to conclude that even the worst home is better than an orphanage, the results being measured by the child's success in getting along in the world after it reached maturity. While this may be an extreme conclusion, its foundation is solid.

It is precisely because the home is not perfect, that it is a good educational institution. Life itself is not perfect. It demands constant adjustment to its imperfections. The children in an orphan asylum are cogs in a machine which either never makes a mistake or, if it does, never acknowledges it. Everything goes according to rule, and the children are turned out as mechanical products. They have never learned to think.

The same sort of arguments apply also against the school, which many parents attempt to make shoulder a burden that should be carried in the home.

The relationship of a child to its home has far more mutual service and reciprocity in it than has the relationship of a child

to its school. All parts of the family are well fitted (as is the case with any organic whole) to subserve each others' needs and to supplement each others' efforts. It is generally recognized that the increasing subordination of family life, in large cities, and the increasing prominence of the school (ending in the 24-hour school and the 12-month school) in the life of the child, is dangerous; and that it is, in fact, producing an annual crop of children not well fitted to be citizens. The normal family is the only effective school for the life of the citizen, and it is hard to see how, human nature being what it is, this situation can ever be changed. "The man who has learned how to lead both an individual and a peaceful life within a large family will find it surprisingly easy to get on with his fellow-citizens in the larger world, for he will have learned the difficult art of respecting the interests of others while maintaining his own."

So long as individuality and variety of character remain an advantage to the world, the family can not be replaced. The stereotyped character which tends to be produced by schools, and still more by institutions, will never be anything except a disadvantage to its possessors and to society.

Further, as Helen Bosanquet has pointed out, it takes a particular child to elicit the good traits of a parent. Few people are able to give to children at large the same sympathy and help that they can give to their own offspring. If they try to do so, they are likely to end merely as officious busybodies. Moreover, it is impossible to make an artificial family by throwing together a man, a woman, and a few children under the same roof. It is the inheritance, the traditions, and the love that are the alchemy which transmutes this assortment of human beings into a family.

Another important reason, generally overlooked, why a mother can care for and educate her children better than can any outsider shepherding the infants of a score of strangers, is that she knows the inherited capacities and defects of the child. The greater part of education consists in developing the former and suppressing the latter, and as a knowledge of heredity becomes more widespread, this function of the home will become more and more

valuable. In most cases, the child will have talents like those of his parents. His own home is the environment in which these talents will most naturally develop and find exercise. There will be fewer round pegs in square holes, when this phase of family life receives the emphasis it deserves.

In all of these essential respects, there is no substitute for the monogamous family—with all its faults.

A home in which the parents control their love for the benefit of their children, and develop an atmosphere of comradeship, instead of seeking to gratify their selfish vanity by making their children mere worshippers of the parental god or goddess, will obviate the danger of the parent-complex. The surplus love turned toward the other mate, instead of toward the child, will do away with disharmony and obviate the dangers on that side. If such wisdom on the part of the parents is coupled with early marriage and reasonably large families, so that their love is more spread out, and not concentrated like the sun's rays through a lens, in a withering blast on a defenseless "only child," there will be few complaints heard about the reciprocal influence of children and the home.

The woman who thinks that she is reserved by nature for greater things, and that she has a message which must be given to the world, while her children are turned over to a servant, may be told emphatically that "No mother is too good to be wasted on her own children."

To sum up, the kind of influence that characterizes a normal home, and promotes the well-being of all its members, and thereby of society as a whole, requires better education of parents than is now the rule. Man must understand woman, and learn to look upon her as an individual, a personality. Woman must not only understand man, but must understand herself, her own biology. Both need further guidance in the care of children. But given these improvements, no other institution can take the place of the family.

' PART II

CONDITIONS THAT INTERFERE WITH THE NORMAL
FUNCTIONING OF THE FAMILY

INTRODUCTION

The following part discusses some of the conditions that interfere at the present time in America with the normal, biological functioning of the family that has been outlined in Part I.

It will be evident that the various abnormalities are not sharply distinct from each other. Most of them are interrelated.

It follows that there is no *specific* remedy for any of these evils. Measures that tend to mitigate one will also tend to mitigate some, or all, of the others. In general, the cure of any one of them is to be sought only in a complete program for the conservation of the family. Every effort to this end will tend to reduce the separate evils. On the other hand, any measure that is advertised to cure a particular evil, without reference to the whole program of conservation, is to be looked upon with suspicion.

It is perhaps needless to say that the division of subjects in this Part II is dictated merely by convenience, and follows the line of popular classification. It is not intended to be systematic, logical, or rigorous. Moreover, there are many minor ills that have scarcely been mentioned.

I. CELIBACY AND THE ASCETIC IDEAL

For the present purpose, celibacy may be defined as a life in which one deliberately and permanently renounces sex. It does not, therefore, apply to the persons (if they are any such) who remain unmarried because they can not find suitable partners, much as they want to do so. Still less does it apply to those, aptly called pseudo-celibates, who remain unmarried but find an outlet for their sexual dispositions in illegitimate ways.

A life of celibacy is chosen by men and women for at least three very different types of reasons.

1. In every generation there is a certain proportion of people who, through illness or inborn defect, are lacking in normal sexual instincts, or who may even have the instincts of the opposite sex rather than those which go regularly with their own. Obviously, such persons are usually not interested in marriage and parenthood, and are likely to remain celibate. It is highly desirable that they do so, for should they have children they might pass on their own abnormal constitutions, and the existence of people with such constitutions is not advantageous to a race.

2. There is also a certain proportion of high-minded people who, because they come of families in which there is some inheritable defect, as for example insanity, make up their minds that it is their duty not to marry. Where the grounds are weighty, this attitude is commendable. Sometimes, however, it is adopted because of a hypercritical point of view which leads the individual to magnify a small defect and to ignore a hundred real merits that ought to be perpetuated. It is necessary to maintain a proper perspective here. A eugenic conscience is a good thing, but it must not have a hair-trigger. The race can well afford to carry a moderate burden of defects if they are associated with numerous qualities of great value.

Even if reproduction is undesirable, it is not always necessary

that persons of this class remain celibate. They might in many instances mate with others like themselves, after sterilization, and enjoy a normal married life except for parenthood. This would increase their personal happiness and would thereby benefit the race, which is always benefited by an increase in the happiness of its members.

3. The third type of celibacy is that which is based on the ascetic ideal, assuming that a life without sex is "higher" and more spiritual than one in which all the instincts find normal satisfaction. Such a point of view is directly or indirectly an outgrowth of religious ideas, and has been found in many different religions, in many different countries and ages. It was foreshadowed among the ancient Hebrews, and at the time of Jesus it was a tenet of a prominent sect called the Essenes. Jesus, who speaks of marriage as an ordinance of God (Matt. 19:4) may have had the Essenes in mind when he remarked that some men remain unmarried for the sake of the Kingdom of Heaven. Paul, in the seventh chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians, took the typical ascetic stand, urging his readers to remain unmarried in order that they might devote all their energy to the service of God; but adding that if any were weak, they should marry rather than do something worse.

Paul's authority, together with the influence of ideas from various oriental cults, and of reaction against sensuous elements of Greco-Roman culture, eventually carried the day, in spite of the opposition of some early leaders, and ascetic celibacy became regarded as the highest type of life, especially desirable for priests; although it was not the law of the church until three or four centuries after Christ, and the law was not enforced strictly until about 1,000 A.D.

What was legally necessary for religious devotees was naturally supposed to be desirable for others who devoted themselves to human welfare; so celibacy was either required or advised for teachers, lawyers, and members of many other professions, during the middle ages and later; indeed, remnants of this point of view can be seen up to the present, as for example, in the idea that certain teachers in universities should be bachelors.

One can easily imagine the tremendous eugenic loss to the race, from a system which led many of the well-educated and intelligent people of the community, the natural leaders, to leave no offspring. Their talents were buried with them in the grave.

While asceticism is probably superstitious in origin, all sorts of attempts have of course been made to rationalize it and find a supposed justification. The name refers it to the course of training of Greek athletes (*askesis* = exercise), among whom (as with modern ones) it was the custom to abstain from sexual intercourse for some time before entering a contest. This seems plausible enough, for such intercourse involves the expenditure of energy, and one would not expend it in this way, any more than by running up 10 flights of stairs, just before going into the arena. Nevertheless, it is by no means certain that this is the real origin of the custom, for the same continence was required before many other ceremonies not of an athletic character. The true explanation (or part of it) is perhaps the feeling of primitive people that continence, like other sacrifices, is pleasing to the gods.

Even if one accepts the customary explanation of Greek *askesis*, yet to push the argument farther and say that, in order to keep his time, thought, and vigor for other work, one should refrain from sexual intercourse throughout life, is no more logical than to say that a pedestrian, in order to get all his energy into his legs, should carry both arms in plaster casts until death. It overlooks the fact that the best development of any part or function of the body is promoted by the harmonious development of the whole. Paul himself, in one of his favorite analogies, likening the Church to the members of a body (Romans 12, 1 Cor. 12) came much nearer to sound biology, and if he had applied the same reasoning to marriage, the Christian Church would have been spared what is, from a biological point of view, one of the greatest blots on its record.

Without going more fully into the origin of the ascetic ideal (which is studied at length in standard works on theology, ethics, and morals, as well as in special histories like that of H. C. Lea), one may easily discern the element of truth in this (as in most

errors), which led Paul astray.¹ From the narrowest point of view, it is true that a married man, charged with the care of a family, can not devote as much time and energy to public service as can a single man. But the narrowest point of view does not extend far, and when the question is examined more carefully, the conclusion may be reversed. Grant that the married man can not devote all his energy to the worship of God: but can the single man, either? The latter is too often the victim of inner conflicts, due to an attempt to suppress one of the most important functions of his body—conflicts that not only use up part of his energy, leaving him inferior in this respect to the happily married, but may in extreme instances deprive him of all energy whatever. There have been many more Saint Anthonies than history records.

In other cases the celibate tries, vainly, to avoid conflict by lapsing into pseudo-celibacy. Only the most unsophisticated would assume that such a life is, on the average, less distracting than normal family life.

Finally, and most important of all in some respects, the celibate continually tends toward being self-centered. He is essentially "a narrow, frequently a warped, individual, ignorant, not only of half of humanity, but of himself," and it is difficult for him to gain the poise, the altruism, the well-rounded outlook of the successful father of a family. He lacks that prolongation and enrichment of the individual life that a family offers.

It appears, then, that the attempt to divert all mental and bodily energy for a long time into one channel is, as might have been expected, largely illusory, and defeats itself.

It is sometimes said that, whatever damage celibacy may have done to the race, it has at least been profitable to the Roman Catholic church, by giving it a body of workers without any other ties than those of their creed and hierarchy. Without entering into doctrinal controversy, it would perhaps be fair to compare

¹ It is supposed that Paul looked for the second coming of Christ within a few years. If one expected the end of the world shortly, one might be pardoned for thinking it important to devote every energy to God's work, regardless of human affairs such as marriage.

100 Roman Catholic priests or nuns in any age or all ages, with 100 married protestant clergymen or women who devoted themselves to social work. The selection could be made in each case either at random, or by picking out the hundred greatest. An impartial consideration would hardly show that the celibate surpassed the married.

Moreover, it is only fair to charge against celibacy part of the breakdown in the system. The licentiousness of the clergy—not an unnatural result from the unnatural standards required of them—was one of the causes of the Reformation, which gave the death blow to Rome's dream of universality and world dominion. In addition, when it began, the ranks of the Church's ablest supporters had been decimated by a thousand years of celibacy. It might have been better off with a married clergy. And at the present time, it is destroying in each generation some of the good strains in its own ranks, through celibacy, while its rivals are perpetuating theirs. The Roman Catholic church itself may, therefore, some day realize, as other churches have, that the maintenance of compulsory celibacy among its workers is not an asset.

A proverb has it that "He travels fastest who travels alone." But he rarely travels farthest; he rarely gets as much enjoyment from his travels as does one who has company; and in case of accident his travels will be brought to a sudden end, while the traveler with companions will be given care and can in due time proceed to his destination. Life is not a sprint, but a long distance contest. In spite of some conspicuous exceptions, an unprejudiced observer will see that in the long run and on the average most of the good work in the world is done by normal people leading normal lives in the midst of happy families; and that most of the trouble in the world is made by abnormal people unhappily married or not married at all.

If these premises are well founded, it is incorrect to assume that a superior man or woman is likely to benefit the world more by remaining single and devoting his whole energy to his work.

But the argument may be carried still farther than this, to maintain that even if a man could accomplish more in his profession

through celibacy, he would nevertheless, no matter how philanthropic his work, yet benefit the world most by marrying and having children, at the loss of some of his efficiency on the job. Looking over the world philosophically, one cannot help seeing that it needs just now not so much an increase in material achievement as in good citizens. The conflicts and maladjustments of society are, in the last analysis, due to the fact that man has still the original nature that he had a thousand generations ago, but has altered his surroundings so greatly that he and his nature do not fit together. More progress would be made in the long run if there were a let-up for a few generations or a few centuries in the improvements of "civilizations" (which improvements are used by the existing population largely to oppress or kill each other), while attention was centered on improving the quality of the race through the production of more capable people and a reduction in the proportion of defectives and degenerates. Anyone who contemplates a life of celibacy with the idea that he can thereby most benefit the race, should consider carefully the possibilities in this direction, avoiding egotism and bearing in mind that, if he really has a talent, the best thing he can do is to keep it in circulation. Ordinarily, it is better for a man to pass his talent on to four or five children, by whom it may be multiplied indefinitely even if he does not use it at all himself, than it is for him to develop it to the full and let it die with him.

Moreover, he should remember that no matter how absorbing his career may be at the outset, it may look much less absorbing in his declining years, when the enthusiasm of his comrades has died with them, and when he surveys the universe, disillusioned and alone. There is a saying to the effect that family life is a luxury in youth, a convenience in middle life, and a necessity in old age; and like many such sayings, it contains a germ of truth that is worth noting.

Finally, the celibate must recall that he is deliberately choosing to let the torch go out, that has been handed on to him from the very beginning of life in the universe. In each generation it has found a tender. Had there been one break in the almost infinite

line, he himself would not be here today. Every one of his myriad of ancestors answered up to the responsibility placed on him. Is he to be the first to refuse the chance of terrestrial immortality that is offered to him? Is he alone to be found wanting?

Of course, no two cases are just alike. Each man must decide for himself. There may be instances where celibacy is desirable. But it can not be maintained as a general rule that celibacy is desirable in order to let people benefit the world by their endeavors.

What has been said of the demerits of celibacy applies, by and large, to women as well as men; but with greater force, for biologically both marriage and parenthood play a larger part in the normal life of women than of men.

If, in spite of all this, one is obliged—because of ill health, for example—to choose a celibate life, he should look the facts squarely in the face and make the best of his situation. Deprived of the normal outlet for a part of his energy, he should seek the outlet nearest the normal one. Women commonly find comfort in teaching, nursing, or caring for the children of others. The nun regards herself as the bride of Christ, and to make the symbolism more satisfying she is garbed in a white wedding dress and formally united with him in a marriage ceremony at the altar, before she takes the veil.

Unless an adequate outlet is found for the energy which is denied its normal outlet in marriage and parenthood, that energy is certain to make trouble inwardly. The celibate man too often becomes a contemptible old granny, thinking only of himself, a masturbator and woman-hater. The celibate woman too often develops into a typical "old maid," lavishing her affections on a cat or dog, and filled with a deep and imaginary sense of the wrongs which her sex suffers in a man-made world.

Throughout the foregoing discussion, my definition of celibacy must be borne in mind, as a deliberate and permanent renunciation of sex in life. It is entirely different from either continence or chastity, both of which will be dealt with in the following section. It does not include the transitory kind of asceticism that sometimes follows satiety, when "the devil a monk would be." Tempo-

rary abstinence is a necessary and desirable thing on many occasions, for various reasons, but these reasons are not any of those which lead one permanently to renounce the world, the flesh, and the devil in favor of a celibate life.

Biologically, there is no superior virtue whatever in ascetic celibacy. For the defective man or woman it is just the thing. For the able and normal it means loss and damage both to the one who practices it, and to the race.

II. PREMARITAL INCONTINENCE

Sexual intercourse, more or less promiscuous, before marriage, interferes with the family by making young people:

1. Less likely to marry. Roswell Hill Johnson (1917) has analyzed this situation. While it is true that some individuals of feeble sexuality might by experience become so awakened as to be less satisfied with a continent life, and might thus in some cases be led to marriage, this is more than counterbalanced by the following considerations.

a. The mere consciousness of loss of virginity has led in some sensitive persons, especially women, to a feeling of inferiority and an unwillingness to marry because of supposed unworthiness.

b. The loss of reputation has prevented marriage with the desired mate. This is not at all uncommon.

c. Infection with syphilis or gonorrhea has forced abandonment of marriage. This is especially common.

d. Illicit experiences may have been so disappointing or disgusting, owing to the character of the consort, that an attitude of pessimism and hatred of the opposite sex is built up. Such an attitude prevents marriage not only directly, but indirectly, since persons with such an outlook are thereby less attractive to the opposite sex.

e. A taste for sexual variety is built up so that the individual is unwilling to commit himself to a restriction of that variety.

f. Occasionally, threat or blackmail by a jilted paramour prevents marriage.

For these and similar reasons, experience of sexual intercourse in illegitimate ways tends to keep a certain number of people from marrying.

2. But of those who do go ahead and marry, a large part if not all have been rendered less fit to marry than they would otherwise have been, for such reasons as:

a. Infection with a venereal disease, which is not only damaging to health, expensive to cure, and the cause of loss of efficiency, but is all too likely to flare up again and infect wife and children.

b. Financially, a young man in particular is likely to be impaired, for patronage of prostitution is frequently an expensive indulgence in every way.

c. Mentally the incontinent of both sexes are almost certain to undergo deterioration, particularly in respect to their standards of mate selection. The more flashy and physical qualities come to be too highly valued, to the subordination of the more substantial and eugenic qualities that are of much greater importance in the long run.

3. Finally, if they do marry, those who have had previous sexual experience are less likely to be able to succeed in marriage. Premarital intercourse almost always represents a purely selfish seeking for excitement and gratification, and the man or woman who goes into marriage with this point of view is severely handicapped from the start.

The man who has been a patron of prostitutes with the idea of proving his fitness for marriage and getting a sexual education is particularly deluded. He succeeds in neither aim.

In the first place, he does not in any way prove his fitness for marriage by patronizing a prostitute. It has often happened that a man under such circumstances experienced such feelings of disgust or aversion that he was entirely impotent, and therefore thought himself defective, whereas in normal marriage he would be wholly normal. On the other hand, success in intercourse with a prostitute, who practices all the tricks of her trade, is no qualification for love of a wife.

In the second place, the attempt to make up a sex-life of fragmentary episodes, in which he is thinking only of his own sensations—and this is what the patronage of prostitution amounts to—is, psychologically, little more than a form of masturbation. It is the worst possible kind of preparation for married life. Probably the most perfect relationship, both physical and mental, can never exist between married people, if either one of them has had previous

sexual experience. This fact, which is widely ignored, deserves the strongest emphasis. The ability to form the deepest and finest bond with one of the opposite sex is a highly specialized and delicate ability. It is easily destroyed. Once lost, it can not be regained.

Often the man who has had previous experience does not dare to tell his bride. He denies it, and throughout the rest of his married life is constantly in fear of exposure, and continually feels that he is a liar and cheat. The same situation holds good for the woman who has been incontinent, and deceives her husband on that point. Mental states thus produced are constant sources of internal friction.

While premarital incontinence thus tends to make people less likely to marry, less fit to marry, and less able to find happiness in marriage, it is true, as Professor Johnson pointed out, that men and women who are incontinent before marriage are probably, on the average, eugenically inferior to those who conform to the standards of the race. Therefore their failure to marry, their sterility from venereal diseases, and the like, are to a certain extent of value to the race in preventing this type from multiplying. But this is a crude and costly way of getting racial progress, and although it may have been of immense advantage in the past, it must now be supplanted by more discriminating and efficient methods of eugenics.

So much for the direct influence of premarital incontinence on matrimony. But there are effects on the individual which are perhaps quite as serious as any that have been mentioned, and which also have an important indirect influence on the home.

1. It tends to deteriorate character by weakening or destroying such important traits as altruistic disinterestedness, the sense of responsibility, and the habit of self-control. Few will question that these are necessary to the individual or the race. Few persons of experience will question that they suffer under a regime of promiscuity or anything resembling that. Every "man of the world" knows that repeated yielding to sexual impulses soon allows them to reach a position of domineering over his life. Nor-

mally, this difficulty is corrected by the acceptance of responsibilities for a wife and children. Sexual impulses, instead of ruling the individual for his own selfish gratification regardless of consequences, are then tied up to the whole of life and made useful.

These feelings of altruism and parental responsibility have undoubtedly been increased by natural selection. Those who had them left offspring to inherit them; those who lacked them left fewer or no offspring, because of the customs that discouraged parentage outside of marriage. But if promiscuity should become general, the way would be open for these necessary qualities gradually to disappear.

Both for the individual and for the race, therefore, it is desirable that the unselfish responsibility which goes with marriage and parenthood should be maintained, and not give place to the selfish irresponsibility which goes with promiscuity or free love.

2. Whatever is true of men in this respect is doubly true of women. The sexual problems of the latter are relatively simple until they have been "awakened." As is well known, the sexual impulses are diffused in them; while no less strong than in man, they are not focused at one point, and are not so easily aroused from the physical side. After initiation, however, woman faces the same problems as man, perhaps in an even more extreme degree. Not only is she then the victim of her own imperious nature, but she is also exposed to be the prey of every male of a certain type who encounters her. It is a matter of popular and age-long experience that women suffer more from irregular sexual relations than do men. But a man can not be incontinent unless some woman is also incontinent. This means either the maintenance of a class of professional prostitutes, which is objectionable for reasons too well known to be rehearsed here, or else the continual seduction of women who have had no previous sexual experience. The latter are then put in the position above sketched. For the purpose of the argument of this paragraph, it is not even necessary to assume that there is anything "sinful" about promiscuity. It is a mere biological fact that it leads to serious psychological consequences for the woman who enters upon it. The man, there-

fore, who adheres to the familiar code of male ethics: "Go as far as the girl will let you," is either grossly ignorant of the feminine constitution, or else is assuming a very serious responsibility in starting a woman on a path from which, once begun, she can too often draw back only with great difficulty and torment.

There are of course no statistics as to the proportion of young people who remain continent before marriage. In parts of Europe, it is said to be unusual for any man to enter marriage without having had previous sexual experience of one kind or another. The same is true of parts of Latin America. In the United States it has sometimes been said that three-fifths of the young men have been incontinent. This is probably too high an estimate at present. M. W. Peck and F. L. Wells¹ found, among college graduate men whom they examined, that less than two-fifths had had experience of sexual intercourse before marriage; and in the majority of these cases only once or at least very infrequently. In replies got by Paul S. Achilles from 316 New York high school students (male; average age 17 years), 7 percent of them claimed to have had experience of sexual intercourse. In similar replies obtained from 40 male and 31 female extension students at Columbia University (average ages 22 and 21 respectively), 50 percent of the men and 22 percent of the women said that they had had sexual experience. It is not stated whether some of these were married people or not.

Whatever the figures may be, any man of experience knows that in most cases they represent a small proportion of hardened rounders, and a large proportion of men who have lapsed only a few times, perhaps only once, from the standards they hold. Moreover, with the increase of sound ideas of mating and reproduction, and with the growing repression of commercialized prostitution, it is

¹ Among the incontinent college graduates whom they studied, Dr. Peck and Dr. Wells found that a distinct majority reported having had no dealings with prostitutes. They consider that in the occasional incontinence of these men (of whom 11 out of 12 took the first step before the age of 21), "probably a leading factor is response to the invitation of more mature women," and that the supposed urge of passion has played no part: "A normal, coercive, organic 'hunger,' appeasable through organic contacts as such, seems out of the question."

well-nigh certain that the proportion of men who remain continent until marriage is growing larger each year in many strata of society.

It is even more difficult to arrive at any conclusion regarding continence among women. Opinions tend to range themselves into two groups—that of the unsophisticated who assume that all women are “virtuous” except a few sinners, and that of the cynical who assume that there is as much incontinence among women as among men. The truth lies somewhere between these extremes. Aside from the study of Dr. Achilles, mentioned above, the only one known to me is that of Katherine Bement Davis, who questioned 1,000 married women, college graduates or of similar educational status. Seventy-one, answering anonymously under conditions of complete secrecy, admitted having had sexual intercourse prior to marriage, but in 35 of these cases it was only with the man whom they afterward married. Excluding the latter leaves only about three in a hundred who were incontinent.

Regardless of the exact figures, there is unquestionably a great difference between those for men and those for women. This reflects the double standard of morality, the effect of which was to wink at, or even approve, premarital experience on the part of men, but to punish severely a woman who followed the same course.

Such a standard was partly based on the biological fact that a woman may become pregnant by sexual intercourse, a man not; and on the social fact that men wished to keep the lines of inheritance free from all contamination, because they were responsible for the maintenance of the offspring of their wives, and did not wish to pay the cost of bringing up some other man's child. The so-called sex necessity of the male, which was often urged to justify this double standard, was of course purely fictitious; though it is true that man's sex urge before marriage is more physical, woman's more psychical.

In a sense, the double standard worked both ways—a fact often ignored. While actual sexual intercourse on the part of the man was regarded more lightly than in the case of the woman (for the reasons named in the preceding paragraph, and others), the man

who "trifled" with a woman's serious affections was reprobated much more severely than was a woman in the reverse case. The lover who jilted his betrothed was looked upon as a scoundrel; he was open to physical punishment from her male relatives, if they were big enough to administer it, and to damages in a "breach of promise" suit, when the ex-betrothed, if a good actress, could easily persuade a jury to convey a substantial part of his fortune to her. On the other hand, a woman might and often did jilt a succession of men, and was merely thought rather smart.

This reciprocal phase of the double standard was presumably based on the idea that marriage was a more serious thing for a woman than for a man. But it has no more merit than has the commonly discussed phase, and is equally due to become obsolete.

When one turns to analyze more fully the causes of the existence of premarital incontinence in American society, they are found to be greatly confused and complicated, but it will not be difficult to distangle a few of the important ones, which will be mentioned without regard to the order of their importance.

1. Commercialized prostitution, the profits of which depend on a continuous supply of new customers, has been responsible for the beginning of most premarital incontinence in men. So much nonsense has been written about the imperiousness of man's passion, which drove him to incontinence, that it is forgotten that probably not one man in a hundred has ever been driven to the *first* step by the imperiousness of this passion. The first offense commonly is induced by the gang spirit, the desire to be thought a man, the desire for adventure, the satisfaction of curiosity, seduction by an older woman¹—these factors ranking in importance more or less in the order named. To these must be added innumerable cases where an ignorant father has given money to his adolescent son and advised him to go to a house of prostitution for the assumed benefit of his health.

Most men will, I believe, recognize the truthfulness of this analysis. It will be seen that there is no place in it for the imperiousness of passion, but that the main influence is commercially exploited and advertised prostitution, particularly in a red light

district. The abolition of such segregated areas, and the steady progress toward the suppression of all commercialized prostitution, result in the elimination of nearly all these factors which led to the first step. Most of all in this matter, it is the first step that costs—too often it leads to others, while, if it is never taken, the young man finds no great difficulty in remaining continent until marriage.

2. Delayed marriage, if accompanied by overstimulation of the sexual dispositions, is a fundamental cause of premarital incontinence. In a sense, it covers nearly everything else, for if people married at the age of puberty, (as lower animals do), there would be little or no occasion for premarital incontinence.

The result of evolution, however, which has given man greatly increased mental powers, has been to lengthen the period of mental preparation, and of physical development as well. Delay in entering actively on the sexual life is one of the adaptations that has had to go along with this evolution. It is important from a racial, as well as from a personal, point of view, that sex should not enter to play a distracting rôle in the life of youth until mental development is nearly completed. This is one of the reasons why sexual activity is not desirable for some years after puberty, although the reproductive organs are ready, in the narrowest sense, for use at that time. The sexual impulses are so much stronger than many others that, if overstimulated and turned loose at this period, they will hold the floor to the exclusion of all rivals. The intellectual life of a whole nation may suffer if sexual activity is the rule among its young people. Competent observers generally agree that the Latin American countries, among others, are handicapped by precisely this condition.

Delay in marriage, while an evil in all circumstances, is a much less serious evil if it is not accompanied by overstimulation of the baulked sexual dispositions. But in modern civilization such overstimulation is difficult to avoid, the whole tone of the daily press, the stage, motion pictures, and fiction being one of eroticism, while the failure to develop other interests and to furnish young people with any other emotional outlet leaves them helpless. The way out of this situation will be discussed in Part III.

3. The third cause which may be mentioned as contributing to premarital intercourse is faulty education—using the term in a very broad sense, to cover lack of a biological point of view, misunderstanding of the psychology of marriage, and faulty training in self-control.

The last-mentioned requirement depends on parents, as it depends on education beginning in earliest infancy and continuing through life.² But anyone who takes the trouble to do so can inform himself about the biological aspects of the problem.

In spite of this, it is sometimes asserted that premarital continence is a mere Puritan dogma, that it is contrary to the facts and implications of science, and that it must be discarded. Those who hold this idea (which is most often, no doubt, merely a rationalization of their own overstimulated sexual impulses) usually take their stand on a half-digested reading at third hand of doctrines to which the Jewish neurologist, Sigmund Freud, has given currency.

Their argument, in brief, is that the desire for sexual intercourse is “natural” and strong, that any thwarting of a strong natural desire is harmful to the individual, and that the sexual impulse must therefore be “expressed”—if finances or any other reason cause a delay in marriage, so much the worse for marriage. Young people must look after themselves; “we’ll be young only once.”

Those who hold any such idea as the foregoing have overlooked some essential facts, which J. A. Hadfield summarizes effectively.

If one is going to do the “natural” thing, he must do the whole of it. He can not pick and choose, taking what part of “Nature” he wants and throwing aside all the rest. Sexual intercourse is natural, but monogamy is no less natural. The parental instinct

² Some educators make a great mistake by representing to young men that they have a desperate and terrible struggle ahead of them in order to “subjugate their passions.” Such an attitude makes many men think success is unattainable. Worse, it is incorrect. The average young man who avoids overstimulation will not find that continence makes any overwhelming demand on his self-mastery. The college students interviewed by Dr. Peck and Dr. Wells agreed that “spooning,” the reading of problem novels, and the viewing of problem plays, increased their difficulties; and that physical and mental activity were the greatest aids to self-control.

and the herd instinct are just as much a part of one's nature as is the mating instinct. If one is going with Nature, he must go the whole way, and that means to go to monogamy, which is the final (up to the present, that is) development of evolution, supplanting the mere random and uncontrolled impulse to mate of which promiscuity is the present expression, and which has not, so far as the evidence indicates, been the normal condition of mankind or any of its ancestors for several million years.

Libertinism does not satisfy other fundamental instincts of mankind, but antagonizes them. Moreover, it does not satisfy more than a part—and that the smallest part—of the individual's own sexual craving, for it ordinarily gratifies only the physical aspect of this craving. But Dr. Freud himself has insisted that the instinct³ for sexual intercourse has both physical and mental components, and that it is the latter, not the former, which is most often repressed. He points out what every experienced person knows, that for complete satisfaction there must be perfect mental as well as physical unity between the mates, and that gratification of the physical component without mental harmony at the same time is certain to result in still further damage to the personality, by the accumulation of psychic tension.

It must be clear to anyone that, under modern social conditions, this complete mental and physical fusion can exist only in legal marriage; for outside of marriage it is known by both parties to be illicit and reprobated by conventional society. The individual who attempts to get rid of inner conflicts by sexual license therefore not only fails to do this, but gets into more conflicts than he faced before.

But, the "emancipated" man or woman replies, why worry about what Mrs. Grundy thinks? Ignore the conventions of society, live above them, and there will be no conflict.

This is easier said than done, for few persons indeed have been brought up in such an atmosphere that the conventions and tabus

³ In this section I am using the term "instinct" in its popular sense. Whatever opinion one may hold as to the ultimate nature and units of instinctive action, the effect is the same, for the present purpose.

of society have played no part in their lives even in infancy. Everyone feels the impalpable pressure of unseen social conventions, whether he is aware of it or not, and the attempt to live "above" them is pretty certain to end in disaster, sooner or later.

For confirmation of this, one need only turn to the evidence. In the early days of psychoanalysis, some analysts who had patients suffering from baulked sexual dispositions did advise intercourse as a relief. They testify that the prescription not only failed to cure, but often made matters worse than before, for the mere expression *in conduct* of an instinctive tendency does not mean that it is liberated psychologically from the complex that has given the trouble, or that the patient is free from his conflict.

To put the matter more simply, mental and nervous disturbances due to lack of a normal sexual life can not be cured by mere physical intercourse, for they are due primarily to mental, not physical, factors (otherwise masturbation would be sufficient for a cure); and these mental factors are not eliminated, but rather aggravated, by mere physical satisfaction of the sexual instincts. In the development of the personality, coitus is constructive if in its proper place, destructive otherwise.

From this brief excursion over the well-trodden paths of Freudian psychology, it will perhaps be evident that any attempt to justify premarital incontinence through it is hopeless. It is of no use to shut one's eyes to the customs and institutions of society: they exist because there is a reason for their existence; and so far as monogamy is concerned, it was pointed out in Part I that it exists because it satisfies fundamental needs of the race. The monogamous family is an adaptation, favored by natural selection, to ensure better progress of the group, better protection of infancy, and greater individual happiness. It is therefore the scientifically correct and up-to-date thing, and libertines who exploit their own inclinations under the guise of Progress are merely arguing their own ignorance and adding to their own mental confusion.

Far from making for progress in society, a general attempt to release the sexual instincts from social restraint would make society impossible, just as would a general attempt to release any other

strong instinct from social restraint. If it is proper for people to have sexual intercourse outside of marriage because they have a strong impulse in that direction, why is it not equally proper to satisfy all other strong impulses as they arise? Most men have felt the impulse to kill an opponent in a quarrel—why not obey it? Why not praise the soldier for desertion on the firing line, the thief for walking off with one's pocket book? He has had a baulked disposition, and could not be expected to suffer by repressing it, thereby becoming the victim of an inner conflict. I have suggested this line of thought in Part I, but it is so pertinent that it is worth mentioning here again, for it contains the key to many problems of the conservation of the family.

From every scientific point of view, the case is clear. The men and women who live promiscuously before marriage are not living "according to nature." They have simply failed to keep up with nature—they are at least some millions of years behind the times. Premarital incontinence is damaging alike to the individual and to the race. It makes people not more fit but less fit for marriage, if it does not prevent their marriage altogether. While it has had a eugenic value in sterilizing the inferior, it is time that this same result be got by more efficient and less costly ways. For the protection of men, women, and children, either singly or as a family, every effort is therefore justified that will tend to reduce the amount of premarital incontinence.

III. DELAYED MARRIAGE

The average age of first marriage of the white population of the United States is about 27 years for men and 24 for women.

Biologically, marriage several years earlier than this would be advantageous, yet this is not a bad age, if it were the rule and not merely an average. The fact that it is an average, however, means that there are as many who marry above that age as below it. If there is any difference in the inherent quality of the two groups, there will be serious racial differences in the results.

It is notorious that there are differences. Negroes marry younger than whites, for instance. Graduates of women's colleges, instead of marrying at 24, marry several years later (and in a large percentage of cases do not marry at all).

As these problems form a main topic of applied eugenics, with which Roswell H. Johnson and I have dealt in another book; and as apart from this the problems created by delayed marriage enter into almost every page of the present book, they will not be discussed at length in this section. The present summary statement is included merely for convenience.

The causes of delayed marriage are almost wholly social or economic. They reflect the increased demands for higher education, the necessity for longer preparation before men are ready to earn a living, the higher standards of living which make women unwilling to marry a man who has a small salary, the increased desire for freedom to pursue one's own inclinations, and so on.

The consequences include such serious matters as:

1. A tendency toward the increase of premarital incontinence.
2. A tendency toward the increase of prostitution. The charge has often been made that prostitution is supported not so much by young, unmarried men as by older, married men. There is no conclusive evidence on this point, and one must depend largely on impressions. My own, based on a somewhat extended, first-hand

observation of prostitution in civilian communities during the war, is that unmarried men preponderate largely among the patrons. I think this is becoming more true all the time, as prostitution is more closely repressed. It is continually more difficult for a married man to frequent prostitutes without risk of detection, and the consequences of detection are continually more serious, as public opinion is aroused on this subject.

To the extent that married men are patrons of prostitution, the cause is probably (a) that they became used to sexual variety in the period before marriage, (b) that they do not understand or are incapable of understanding real love, and (c) that their wives do not enter normally into the physical side of the marriage relation. Wrong education and delayed marriage are largely responsible in each case.

3. Increase of venereal diseases, growing out of the two factors previously enumerated.

4. Fewer children, because (a) people who marry late have a shorter period left when they are capable of having children, (b) they lose inclination for children, and (c) sterility is more likely to have set in.

5. Neuroses and other mental disturbances, due to a strain or a supposed strain on the emotions, resulting from continence accompanied by overstimulation, or from illegitimate incontinence, or from deprivation of children.

6. Sterility. Apart from such obvious causes as gonorrhea, delay in childbearing frequently leads to barrenness. Some of the causes of this are well-known, some are obscure. But the fact is clear. Just as nothing succeeds like success, so nothing promotes fertility like bearing a child or two.

7. Unhappy marriages, due to all the foregoing causes together with the fact that older men and women are set in their ways and do not adjust themselves to marriage so easily.

To these conditions, and many others that will occur to the reader, must be added the special penalties which the woman suffers, in more painful or dangerous childbirth and greater infant mortality, as well as ovarian diseases.

Many of the changes necessary to bring about earlier marriage in the part of the population where it is most needed are discussed in Part III. Perhaps the most hopeful change, in this connection, is that which is now slowly occurring in the educational world, where an attempt is being made to increase the flexibility of the system so that superior students can get through more rapidly, without having to drag along in lockstep with the mediocre and the dullards. If the efforts in this direction are pushed to their logical conclusion, there seems to be no reason why a young person of superior ability should not shorten the present period of preparation for life by from three to five years. This would mean the possibility, in favorable cases, of marriage just that much sooner than at present. From the standpoint of eugenics, then, as well as from others, the development of the school system in this direction is to be welcomed enthusiastically.

Some changes of public sentiment are desirable, so that young people will not feel it necessary, at the beginning of their married life, to live on the same scale that their parents have attained after a quarter of a century of effort. Many a young couple wants to marry, and could marry and live in comfort, but postpones marriage from a feeling that it would require too great a sacrifice of its artificial and ill-chosen standards.

On the other hand, many a father could easily aid his son to get a start in life, but does not do so. Sometimes the son refuses aid, having a false feeling of pride about "standing on his own feet." If the son also refused a legacy at his father's death, his feeling of pride would be consistent; but this has rarely been known to occur. A wise father will remember that his wealth is going to his children eventually, and will not hesitate to let them use a little more of it in his own life-time, if such use will mean earlier and happier marriage for them.

If such a practice were so universal as to have the compulsion of custom, it might work unfavorably, for parents would then be tempted to limit the number of their children to those whom they could supply with ample marriage portions. Something of this sort seems to occur in parts of Europe where every daughter must

be provided with a dowry. But so long as the practice is voluntary and applies only to those parents who have a surplus, there seems to be no reason against it.

In the interests of eugenics, the business world might well take a firm stand against the practice of paying young men in certain professions only a nominal wage at first. A young lawyer, for instance, may get his B.A. at a college of liberal arts, follow this with a four-year course in law, and emerge at the age of 26 or 28, when he should be already married. He enters some firm with a high reputation, and is compelled to work for several years for \$10 or \$15 a week, on the supposition that the mere honor of working for such a famous partnership is compensation enough. The same attitude prevails in some of the more respectable banks, and many other businesses; while every young physician expects to serve as hospital interne for a year or two, for nothing more than his board and clothes. Colleges not only offer many fellowships that carry pay inadequate for a married man, but in some cases even make celibacy a requirement for the tenure of these positions. If the industrial world can consider the justice of a minimum wage for the unskilled, it would seem reasonable to ask that young men of the type under consideration here—men from good families and endowed with superior ability—be recognized as worth at least a living wage, and be no longer required to postpone marriage in order to work for mere honor.

IV. BROKEN HOMES

The break-up of homes is generally supposed to be more frequent each year. There is no way of getting at the actual number, for they include many different types, and in some instances the fact that the home is virtually broken is known only to the intimates of those concerned. Broken homes may for the present purpose be roughly classified as follows:

1. Internally broken, but outwardly intact.
2. Outwardly as well as inwardly broken, by
 - a. Abandonment, desertion, or non-support;
 - b. Separation mutually agreed upon;
 - c. Divorce.

In a sense, a home is also broken by the death of husband or wife; but as other members of the family usually rise to the occasion and preserve many of the features of home life, this case will not be discussed in the present section.

Divorce is often thought of as constituting the real problem of broken homes, but this is an error, for it is not the decree of a court that breaks a home: it is the internal conditions. Divorce, therefore, is merely one evidence of the existence of broken homes. Any honest attempt to deal with divorce or any of the other special problems involved must begin at the beginning and inquire what breaks homes, rather than spend time arguing about how, when a home has once been broken irremediably, the fact can best be registered in legal form.

Taking divorce records, however, as the only authentic data on the number of broken homes, it is known that they have been increasing rapidly in the United States—doubling and quadrupling with the decades until there is now a divorce recorded for every seven marriages—a rate higher than that of any foreign country

and twice as high as most. To cite only some recent years, the figures are:

YEAR	MARRIAGES	DIVORCES
1916	1,040,684	112,036
1922	1,126,418	148,554
1923	1,223,825	165,139

It will be seen that divorces are still increasing in number more rapidly than marriages. Thus while marriages increased in 1923 over 1922 by 8.4 percent, divorces increased by 11 percent. In some states and cities, there is now a divorce for every three, or even every two, marriages.¹

The problem of broken homes has, as was intimated above, been much obscured by the fact that it was popularly assumed to be equivalent to the problem of divorce, that it was treated almost wholly from the legal and economic sides, and that the atmosphere was clouded by lawyers' technicalities and quibbles over non-support, restitution of conjugal rights, forgiveness and resumption of cohabitation, separation from bed and board, interlocutory decrees, alimony, and so on. These matters are biologically immaterial, and the present treatment will largely ignore them, endeavoring to get down to the biological conditions underlying the

¹ This form of comparison, which is made by the Census Bureau and widely circulated, is not statistically justifiable. Since a divorce usually follows only after some years of marriage, the number should not be contrasted with the number of marriages in the same year, but with the number of marriages that occurred say five years previously. Moreover, some marriages are terminated by death of one partner, before they have a chance to appear in the divorce record. Both of these sources of error tend to make the divorce rate appear even lower than it is, in comparison with the marriage rate. Again, in many cities and states the number of marriages represents the resident population, while the divorce records are filled with transients, who have come from other states for the sole purpose of divorce. It would be impossible, with the imperfection of American vital statistics, to avoid all the fallacies, and the comparison given above is therefore accepted, with this warning to the reader against taking it at its face value.

break-up of homes. This is the more necessary because the reasons set forth in pleas for divorce are almost never the true reasons. Usually the separating partners lie fluently to suit their own purposes; often they themselves do not know what are the real, fundamental reasons that have caused their matrimonial bark to drift on the rocks. It is high time, therefore, that the point of view were changed for a while, and divorce studied from a different angle.

In passing judgment on a marriage, the interests to be considered, in order of importance, are: (1) the welfare of society or of the race, (2) of the children, (3) of husband and wife. The usual view looks in a mirror instead of at the facts, putting the interests of husband and wife paramount and light-heartedly assuming that if their whims are sufficiently consulted, their children and the race will profit accordingly. Reformers of the marriage institution mostly emphasize this tendency, instead of breaking away from it, and their writings are full of impassioned and often persuasive pleas for the sacredness of personal freedom, the immorality of a marriage in which love has died, and the shocking fate of children compelled to live in an inharmonious household. While there is some truth in all this, and the interests of the three are closely interrelated, yet one must adopt a starting point.

Here is the fork of the road. It is necessary for each one to clear his mind, before discussing broken homes, and to take his stand either on the side of the egoists, to whom nothing looms so large as their own pleasure, or on the side of those who believe that only in a strong and progressive society in which children are given first consideration, is the greatest and most lasting happiness of husband and wife, and the greatest welfare of all, to be found.

From the latter standpoint, which is here adopted, the common plea that love is the only justification for marriage, and that when it has ceased to exist, it is worse to compel people to live together than to allow them to separate, requires careful analysis. In the first place, "love" does not mean the same to any two persons. The romantic and highly egoistic idea of love, which is reflected in most present-day literature and art, is a relatively late develop-

ment in civilization, being little heard of before the time of the Crusades, when returning knights imported oriental habits of reflection and poetic analysis of love.² Many of the people who sing of

² The Arabian Nights furnish abundant illustrations of the oriental attitude toward love. An earlier illustration, given by 'Alī ibn Husain al-Masūdī (died about 956 A.D.) in his *Murūj al-Dhahab wa Ma'ādin al-Jawāhīr* (Meadows of Gold and Mines of Precious Stones) vi, 368ff, is derived from a gathering at the home of Yahyā ibn Khalid al-Barmak, tutor of the Caliph Harūn al-Rashīd. This nobleman proposed to his guests that each should give a summary definition of love.

'Alī ibn al-Haitham: "Love is the fruit of the conformity of species and the index of the fusion of two souls. It emanates from divine beauty, from the pure and subtle principle of substance. Its extent is unlimited; its development a cause of loss to the body."

Abū Malikān of Hadhramaut: "Love is a magic breath; it is more hidden and more incandescent than a live coal in the ashes; it exists only by the union of two souls and the mingling of two forms. It penetrates into and infuses itself into the heart, as the moisture of a fog does into the pores of the earth. It reigns over everything, conquers all intelligences, and commands all wills."

Muhammad ibn al-Hudhail: "Love places its seal on the eyes and its imprint on the heart; it circulates through the body and penetrates to the depths of the entrails. It throws thought into disorder and the intelligence into mobility; with it nothing remains unaltered; no promise binds it; all misfortunes descend on it. Love is a drop dipped from the ocean of death, a swallow taken from the reservoirs of annihilation. But it draws its expansive force from nature itself and from the beauty which resides in all created beings. The man who loves is prodigal, deaf to the appeals of prudence, and insensible to reproaches."

Hishām ibn al-Hakīm of Kūfā: "Destiny has made of love a net, from which can escape only hearts that are sincere in misfortune. When a lover falls into its depths and is caught in its meshes, he can never emerge from it safe and sane, nor can he avoid it by flight. Love is born of the beauty of the human figure and of the affinity and sympathy between souls. With it death penetrates to the entrails and to the depths of the heart; the most elegant tongue is frozen; the king becomes a subject, the master becomes a slave and abases himself before the lowest of his servitors."

Ibrāhīm ibn Yassar al-Naththām: "Love is more evasive than a mirage, more rapid than wine circulating in the arteries. It is a delicate clay baked in the oven of divine power. So long as it is restrained, its fruits are full of flavor; but if it exceeds its bounds it becomes a mortal madness, a malady whose ravages are terrible and irremediable. Like a cloud, it dissolves in rain on human hearts; there it causes trouble to germinate and brings grief to fruition. The man conquered by love suffers without respite; he even heaves his bosom

it so enthusiastically are neurotics. On the other hand, many people are quite incapable of such love, who are nevertheless capable of happy marriage and the successful rearing of a family.

Examination will show that the romantic love on which the advocates of divorce by mutual consent are wont to insist so fervently is essentially the love that is felt in youth—the mating love. But it is absurd to suppose, as the reformers do, that this love can, or should, exist unchanged throughout life. There must be an evolution in the feeling of love, as in other things. In normal human beings the evolution is something like this:

1. The infant loves himself. He is concerned wholly with what he can get out of the world, and seeks continually to gratify himself by getting pleasurable sensations.

2. The child goes a step farther, and begins to love his parents (especially the one of opposite sex); then others who are near to him and from whom he benefits.

3. About the time of puberty, the affections are largely directed toward those of the same sex (i.e., homosexual). This is the age when a boy is loyal to "the gang," while girls often have "crushes" with schoolmates or teachers of the same sex.

4. After the age of puberty, the youth begins to take an interest in the opposite sex outside the family circle. This period of "puppy love" is sometimes painful to bystanders; but so are various other manifestations of adolescence. The period is characterized by normal and acute interest not in a single person of the opposite sex, but in all, though preference is shown for various individuals at various times. It is the age of the flapper, and of flirtation; it is a preparation for marriage, in which, by the familiar process of trial and error, the boy or girl is developing the emotional nature, establishing ideals, and getting ready to mate. It is followed by

5. The period of mating, in which the affections are at last fixed

only with an effort. Paralysis menaces him: constantly plunged in melancholy he passes his nights without sleep, his days without peace; grief makes him hungry but he is nourished only by his sighs."

And so on through a long line of other worthies. All this is quite in the modern style, of which one will find very few examples in classical antiquity.

upon a single person, and marriage takes place. Life is now normally suffused with sexual feelings for some years, unless the edge has been taken off this period by premarital incontinence, in which case satiety may manifest itself rapidly. The saying of Alexander Dumas, Jr., that within two weeks after marriage every man feels he has made a mistake in marrying, is not true, but it has an element of truth in it in so far as premarital incontinence followed by rapid satiety in marriage tends to produce a feeling of revulsion.

6. Within a few years, this phase of love is normally enlarged by the arrival of children, and parental love becomes an important part of adult life, the love of the mate not occupying the exclusive place that it did in the previous period. S. T. Coleridge throws a sidelight on this in his *Table Talk* of September 27, 1830. So-and-so, he remarks, "once said that he could make nothing of love, except that it was friendship accidentally combined with desire. Whence I conclude that he was never in love. For what shall we say of the feelings which a man of sensibility has toward his wife with her baby at her breast! How pure from sensual desire! Yet how different from friendship!"

7. As the strength of all physical feelings wanes with advancing age, this sort of love is again gradually broadened into a love for all humanity, which finds its outlet in benevolence and philanthropy, and remains until the end of life, although there is a temporary flare-up of sexual interest at one period (in women, about the menopause; in men, usually between 50 and 60), as if the organism, realizing that it was rapidly reaching the point where its fundamental purpose of reproduction could no longer be fulfilled, wanted to make the most of its few remaining opportunities. The soberest men and women sometimes become foolish at this point. When a prominent person suddenly breaks into print as a champion of free love, or immerses himself in sexual studies, reference to *Who's Who* nearly always confirms the suspicion that he is at the age of final incandescence.

This evolution of the emotional life, which is here presented in a much simplified and inadequate outline,³ is of the highest impor-

³ There are, of course, other points of view from which the same subject may be analysed.

tance in any consideration of happiness in married life. While every normal person goes through this development, the stages are not sharply separated. Moreover, the feelings of no stage are wholly lost; they are merely expanded and subordinated as the next stage is entered. The person who expects to remain all the rest of his life in any one of these stages except the last is either defective or a fool.

There are, nevertheless, all too many cases of arrested development. Many a spoiled child really never gets beyond the first stage, and goes through life trying to force everybody and everything to minister to his own pleasure; indulging in a tantrum or developing symptoms of hysteria when he can not have his own way. Many another never outgrows the post-adolescent stage: thus the flapper with gray hair, and the elderly male flirt who is constantly trying to make an impression on young women ("No fool like an old fool!") are familiar to all.

Such an analysis simplifies the question of love in marriage. The man or woman who finds, after a few years of married life, that the old thrill is being lost, and who seeks continually to renew it by flirtation or adultery, is simply confessing that he or she is suffering from arrested development—that evolution is not proceeding normally. As a matter of fact, such people have usually never freed themselves from the auto-erotic stage of childhood; marriage means to them merely the opportunity to secure pleasurable sensations. Such individuals are always unhappily mated. When their "love" cools, they feel that they must rekindle the fire by finding a new mate—either legally or illegally; and so continue through life until satiety or physical decline leaves them to seek satisfaction in salacious fiction or in the bald-headed row at "leg shows."

Is it necessary to remould the institution of marriage, merely to gratify the auto-erotic cravings of these cases of arrested development? Would it not be saner to alter modern educational methods in such a way as to permit these people to go through the normal course of development, which ends by building up a home full of children that radiates altruism into all the activities of life?

Before agreeing, then, to the cant phrase that it is immoral for two people to continue to live together when love has ceased to exist between them, one must inquire just what love means in this connection. No one can or should continue long in the intense, auto-erotic form of "love" that neurasthenics and reformers have in mind; and many people (perhaps most, if the whole world is considered) who are capable of happy marriage and successful parenthood, are not capable of any such introspective expression of love.

In some ways it would be preferable to turn the statement around, and to say that marriage is immoral if hatred exists between the partners. But this is largely subject to control. The selfish, fickle, and feebly-inhibited will always give trouble in this respect. Marriage can not be "factory rebuilt" for such defectives. Some people never find happiness in marriage, no matter how many times they try their luck; the same people often never find happiness in work or in anything else. Happiness simply is not in them. Is it not time to realize that persons so constituted can not adjust to any adult situation? And is it not stupid to talk of remaking the mores for the benefit of a small minority who are hopeless anyhow, really of defective mental constitution? If there is a remedy for this evil, it is in early training, mental hygiene, and biological education, not in trial marriage or easy divorce.

An analysis of love, then, suggests the solution to many problems of broken homes. Here again, it is found that society is at work, in its usual way, to settle the problem at the wrong end—to wail over the consequences instead of removing the causes. Any movement to prevent broken homes by such measures as trial marriage and divorce by mutual consent is a crime against the race unless it is at the same time accompanied by a much more vigorous effort to remove the causes of broken homes.

Approaching a little nearer to individual broken homes, it will be found that at the bottom of most of them (some students have said 90 percent or more) there is the fundamental problem of sexual maladjustment. People who are perfectly adjusted to each other in this respect do not seek separation, either by desertion or divorce.

This fact frequently does not transpire in cases of publicity—frequently, indeed, discordant partners themselves do not realize just what the trouble is. But lawyers and judges who hear many divorce petitions know that this is the truth. It is safe to say that sexual maladjustment plays a part in almost every divorce, and that it is the most important factor in a majority, even though not known to be such by the parties concerned. Could anything be more illogical than the present policy of society, to (1) let people marry in ignorance, (2) let them divorce because of this ignorance, and (3) then let them, still ignorant, make new matings, many of which will be broken up in the same way and for the same reason?

Obviously, here is one of the strategic points for an attack against the evil. A clearer understanding of what love really means, a better preparation for marriage on the part of both men and women, more deliberate and carefully considered mating, and clinics which, when necessary, could furnish enlightenment concerning particular problems, would do more to abate the evil than all legal reforms put together.

Beyond this, there are of course innumerable minor problems, legal, economic, social, and what not, which require study and action. To discuss these fully would both be outside the province of this book, and unnecessary, because these are precisely the phases of the whole question that are already getting attention—much more than they deserve, in comparison with the fundamental issues. It is worth noting, in passing, that marriages in which husband and wife are of different race or nationality figure preponderantly in the divorce record; and that to a large extent divorce is sought by those who have neither children nor property to hold them together. In a study of divorce petitions filed in Minneapolis, Mildred D. Mudgett found that half of the applicants were clients of some charitable agency, and most of the families had court records for one cause or another—one family had appeared in all the courts of the city, a total of 28 times, another 21, and so on down. There is a great danger in looking at the mass statistics of divorce, and becoming alarmed over them, without analyzing them to find just what sort of people contribute them. It is

known that both the delinquent rich and the delinquent poor appear in large ratio in the records of all forms of broken homes. Is the institution of monogamy to be remodeled for the benefit of these two classes, or is some other remedy more appropriate?

Even after the necessary changes have been made, so that people will have a wider choice in marriage, be educated to choose more wisely, and understand the physiology and psychology of love, there will remain enough cases of broken homes to require some sort of court action. As to desertion, abandonment, non-support, and the like, the obvious thing to do is to bring back the departing partner and, by social case work or law enforcement, to adjust the difficulty in some more intelligent and effective way than is involved where a man or woman merely packs and departs, leaving no address.

For such cases, and for all divorce cases filed, there should be clinics, to which reference will be made in the first instance. Here investigation would often remove causes of misunderstanding and friction (particularly if due to ignorance about love and marriage), and the matrimonial ship might start again on its course in a smoother sea. Even today, humane lawyers and intelligent judges, though little qualified for the attempt, succeed in effecting many reconciliations.

The requirement in some states that all applications for divorce be published and all hearings be public has been harmful. Under these conditions of pitiless publicity both parties bow their necks and are not in a mood to consider reconciliation—self-esteem is too much injured. Mutual consent and collusion, which, under present laws, are unlimited sources of fraud and deceit, may make such publicity necessary, but it would probably be just as effective if the facts were made public only six months after a divorce is granted, and not published at all when a divorce is denied. The break-up of many homes that are only slightly cracked would thereby be prevented.

Certainly it is an outrage that a biological question should be made a matter of typical police court procedure, with shyster lawyers ranting and bullying the witnesses for the edification of

eager spectators. It is hard to see why lawyers properly have any business at all in such a matter. A Court of Domestic Relations, with its own investigators and the routine assistance of a competent clinic, should handle all problems involving broken homes, and lawyers should not be permitted to make a living by exploiting family differences. Since they get a fee for securing a divorce, and nothing for effecting a reconciliation, it is too much to expect that they will be as much interested in the latter as in the former result. Many—to their honor—do seek, and often effect, reconciliations, but they are not specially qualified for such an effort and should be superseded by those who are better trained for the attempt. The situation is worsened by the fact that divorce practice is either in the hands of young attorneys, who have to take anything they can get in order to live, or of men who are not the most reputable in the profession. The average lawyer with self-respect and high standards despises divorce work and will not take it if he can avoid it.

From the foregoing, it ought to be clear that “mutual consent” is not an adequate excuse for the break-up of a home. In many cases incompatibility can be cured by re-education more satisfactorily than by divorce. Grounds that are really valid, from a eugenic viewpoint, include such as insanity or other serious mental disability, chronic alcoholism, long imprisonment for crime, and extreme cruelty or other evidence that the offender is not normal. In these cases the innocent partner should be given an opportunity to establish a new home and contribute children to society, while the offending one should be prevented from future reproduction.

At first sight it would appear that no grounds could commend themselves more to a biologist than infertility and impotence. But neither case is so simple as it may seem.

Fritz Lenz has pointed out that if infertility were admitted without question, in petitions for divorce, the way would be open to unlimited abuse. People could cohabit for a time, with contraception or abortion, and then ask for divorce on the ground that the union was childless: it would be extremely difficult to disprove their claim.

Impotence in man is often wholly mental in origin, due to his own wrong education or that of his wife. Reference to a clinic is the correct procedure.

In sum, the attempt to deal with broken homes by the customary legal palliatives is limited in its usefulness. Whatever is done, there should be uniform legislation, instead of the present chaotic condition in which each state makes different requirements. But the real hope for success is in prevention rather than cure. It is foolish to waste time on a "divorce problem." The real problem is to prevent unhappy marriages by (1) better education for marriage and (2) better selection of mates. After all this, if there are still difficulties, a clinic can do much. The actual legal registration of the fact of a broken home is the least of all problems. If the energy now directed toward getting "reforms" in the divorce laws were directed for a time toward making marriage more carefully considered and intelligently entered, the results would be surprising.

V. PROSTITUTION

Prostitution, sometimes referred to as the oldest of professions, has been in existence, in a multiplicity of forms, since the beginning of history, in all civilized and many uncivilized countries. So varied have been its manifestations that it has even been difficult to agree on a definition of it. For the purpose of the present discussion, it will perhaps be sufficient to fall back on common usage, defining prostitution as more or less promiscuous sexual intercourse in which a woman gives her body for hire (not necessarily paid in cash, but often in some other form of remuneration, as clothes or entertainment).

It is naturally impossible to arrive at any exact idea of the number of women engaged in prostitution, or the number of men who are their regular or occasional patrons. Some fantastic figures have been in circulation. Among the more reliable calculations is that of the Chicago Vice Commission, which supposed that there were 5,000 commercial prostitutes in that city in 1911. Investigators in San Francisco (1917) believed there were 1,000 prostitutes in the segregated district, popularly known as the Barbary Coast, and 3,000 more scattered throughout the city. George J. Kneeland estimated 25,000 for the borough of Manhattan alone (1911) in his report on *Commercialized Prostitution in New York*. This has been thought by many to be an over-estimate. According to much more thorough investigations which Bascom Johnson records there were in Manhattan in 1921 not more than 3,000 prostitutes.

The causes which have created prostitution are extremely numerous and diverse, hence an analysis is not simple. Obviously the institution represents a partial breakdown or inadequacy of the ordinary family. For the present purpose I believe it will be most useful to attack the question from a little different point of view, by inquiring first the reasons why women become prostitutes, and secondly the reason why men become patrons of prostitutes.

Such an approach is quite contrary to that of a certain school of writers, which holds that the only reason for the existence of prostitution is the depravity of the male sex. It is true that if there were no patrons there would be no prostitutes. But it is naïve to suppose that the demand is wholly created by the patrons. Prostitution is a business—hence the demand is fostered by advertising, solicitation, and every means that can be devised to create new customers and keep old ones. The prostitute does whatever she can in this direction, and she is helped by innumerable middlemen—the army of parasites who live, directly or indirectly, off her earnings. Hence any attempt to eliminate prostitution by attacking solely the men who patronize it is inadequate. They should be dealt with vigorously, but the easiest and quickest results are to be had from attacking the business agents and property owners. On the other hand, it is certainly as much of an offence against society to buy as to sell, in this business, and the males who patronize prostitution should be prosecuted at least as vigorously as the females whom they patronize.

Returning to the analysis of reasons why women take up prostitution as a career, one recognizes that there are as many different reasons as there are prostitutes, and that no easy generalization will do more than blur the picture. Nevertheless, it is possible to classify some of the reasons roughly in a number of overlapping groups, of which the following particularly deserve consideration.

1. Biological. The existence of girls with (a) strong sexual impulses and (b) weak inhibitions. From one-third to one-half of all commercial prostitutes examined in the United States have been found to be feeble-minded. Most of the rest are mentally defective in one way or another. Jau Don Ball and Hayward G. Thomas determined that 97 percent of the 320 prostitutes on the Barbary Coast in 1915–1917 were mentally abnormal. Walter L. Treadway ascertained that 80 percent of 206 women (147 white, 59 Negro) whom he examined at the State Industrial Farm for Women, Lansing, Kansas, had an abnormal personal make-up, and 55 percent had some definite mental defect, which in almost every case was directly accountable for their life of prostitution. L. O.

Weldon examined 100 delinquent white women in Louisville, Ky., and found 38 of them definitely feeble-minded, 43 constitutional psychopathic inferiors, and 12 with various psychotic conditions, leaving only 7 of the 100 who could by any stretch of the imagination be called mentally normal. Such evidence might be multiplied indefinitely: the illustrations given have been chosen merely because they were made by trained investigators and are representative of several different localities. It is evident that prostitution is largely a problem of mental disease and defect.

2. Social. Delayed marriages on the one hand, unhappy marriages and broken homes on the other, help many young women to drift into prostitution. Most prostitutes have been married at one time or another—often prior to entering the profession. Most of them come from abnormal homes—undisciplined, joyless, without traditions. In many cases the mother has worked outside, and therefore maintained no effective supervision over her children.

3. Esthetic. The longing of young women for luxuries which they can not afford out of legitimate wages puts a premium on their earning "easy money" in this way. Taken in conjunction with the materialistic standards that are widely held, with the idea that it is of paramount importance to "have a good time," and with the feeble inhibitions and lack of perspective of these women, the love of luxury is a potent influence that must be reckoned with in every proposal to deal with prostitution. A vain, shallow, indolent, oversexed girl who has made a meagre living by hard work in unattractive surroundings finds that by prostitution she can seemingly live without working, get abundant sexual gratification, wear expensive clothes, dwell in a comfortable hotel or apartment house, take her meals at good restaurants, enjoy many entertainments, and have the society of men of good standing in the community. Is it surprising that the real but sometimes more remote disadvantages of a life of prostitution are obscured to her weak intellect by these apparently real and more immediate attractions?

Prostitutes are fond of relating that they were forced into their

calling as an alternative to starvation. In general, the reasons they give for becoming prostitutes can never be taken seriously, for they represent merely what the speaker thinks she is expected to say, or what she thinks will produce a favorable impression. In this particular case it is safe to assert that, in the United States at least, not one prostitute in a thousand ever became such as an alternative to starvation—although many prostitutes, because of defective mentality and will power, can perhaps earn little more than a bare living by honest work. It is the desire for unearned luxury that tempts.

4. Educational. Defective information concerning sex and parenthood, defective training in self-control, defective standards of values, help to produce many prostitutes.

5. Political. The organization of prostitution in large cities gives ward bosses a chance to intrench themselves. New prostitutes must be recruited continually to keep business good.

6. Economic. Prostitution apparently offers (a) easy money for the woman herself and (b) an extremely lucrative revenue to the middlemen and exploiters of prostitution.

The first, second, and fourth of these factors, with appropriate changes, help to explain why men become patrons of prostitutes. An economic factor also operates (cf. No. 6, above) in that some young men think it is cheaper to patronize prostitutes than it is to marry.

The interplay of all these and similar factors, then, tends to produce both supply and demand. The factors are of varying weight but, as usual where the family is concerned, the biological ones are at the bottom. Without defective women and unscrupulous, concupiscent men, "the business"¹ would not last long.

On the other hand, the biological factors are far from sufficient to account for the great development of organized prostitution.

¹ This is the euphemism by which those engaged in it commonly refer to commercialized prostitution. An interesting parallel is "the trade," which in Great Britain now always means the organized traffic in alcoholic liquors. A century or two ago, the same term would have been understood as meaning the industry of exporting slaves from Africa to America.

This is to be explained principally by the economic factors. Prostitution—in modern times in the United States, at least—has been a highly organized industry, based on graft and corrupt politics in large cities, and using all the familiar devices of modern business to attract customers and increase profits. This fact points plainly to the easiest line of attack, as I have insisted above.

Among the results of prostitution have been:

1. Degradation of a large number of men and women in each generation.
2. Wide spread of venereal diseases.
3. Corruption and graft in politics.
4. Fostering of all sorts of sexual offenses such as seduction and rape, and of sexual perversions.
5. Broken homes.
6. Juvenile delinquency.

All these evils interact. The effect of all of them has been wholly bad on the individuals concerned. Some of the effects have been beneficial, from the narrowest point of view, to the family and society, because the withdrawal from family life, and sterilization through venereal diseases or early death, of physical and mental inferiors has prevented them from perpetuating their kind, and has thus tended to purify the race. But the evil effects of prostitution, and the fact that they reached a great many superior people as well as inferior ones, make it an undesirable method of eugenics. It must be supplanted by more humane, intelligent, and discriminating methods of purifying the race.

Methods of attack (described in many publications of the American Social Hygiene Association, New York City) have been worked out so carefully and applied so successfully in the United States during the last 10 or 20 years that victory can now be counted on. Briefly the effort is made in the first instance to eliminate the organized, commercial features of prostitution; both because this is the source of the most harm, and because it is the most easily reached. While many individual prostitutes are in the business because they enjoy it and prefer it to other ways of making a living, the middlemen who exploit it are interested only in the

money there is in it. Once it is made unprofitable—a feasible task for any community—they will quit and turn to something else.

The evil flowing from the commercial organization of prostitution will be understood if it is borne in mind that the harm wrought by prostitution is in direct proportion to the number of persons it affects. In order that the business may be most profitable, it is necessary to have it concentrated in a central location and well advertised. Segregation in a Red Light District makes it easily accessible to all. This is one of the strongest arguments against the policy of segregation. Even if abolishing a Red Light District did no more than scatter the inmates, it would yet be a benefit, for it would make them less easily found and thereby diminish the volume of their business.

But as a fact, any kind of honest law enforcement does much more than this. It makes a large proportion of the prostitutes and almost all the middlemen—the pimps, panders, procurers, madames, and the like—drop out altogether. The few prostitutes who remain must keep under cover and find customers only by stealth, with the result that they will find perhaps a tenth as many as formerly, and the harm they can do is diminished correspondingly.

Beyond this, however, the fundamental theory on which segregation has been practiced is incorrect in every way. It has been alleged by its defenders that, prostitution being a necessary evil, the wisest course is to recognize it as such and to concentrate it in one district where order can be maintained and the evil aspects reduced to the minimum.

Probably no well-informed person in the United States now accepts this specious plea. The results of abolition of the Red Light Districts (of which some 250 have been closed in the United States during the last 25 years) have been so uniformly favorable as to leave the segregationists not a leg to stand on. And it is also recognized that under any circumstances segregation never affected more than a small fraction of the prostitutes in a community. Most of them were outside the District and not subject to farcical “regulation,” but they profited by the general stimulus to prostitution which the District furnishes.

The first step, then, in the repression of prostitution is to regard it as a crime, and honestly to enforce the law against it, treating anyone engaged in it in any form as a criminal, and making no distinction of sex.

There is a widespread European school of thought which regards any open advertisement or solicitation as a crime, but holds that the act of prostitution itself is a purely personal matter which must not be interfered with. In other words, this point of view would punish a woman for asking a man to commit an act which, if and when committed, is considered to be entirely legal. It would be hard to find a better illustration of the extent to which ancient prejudices interfere with the application of common sense to law enforcement.

While a law enforcement campaign is the keynote to the immediate repression of prostitution, it must be accompanied by vigorous efforts to deal with all of the factors mentioned above, which keep prostitution in existence. Better sex education, widespread mental hygiene, more recreation, segregation of the feeble-minded, protection of the home and family (especially of juveniles), more careful mating and more intelligent marriage—every such improvement will indirectly reduce prostitution.

VI. VENEREAL DISEASES

Of the four or five diseases commonly known as venereal because they are most frequently transmitted through sexual intercourse, the two important ones are gonorrhea and syphilis.

Inasmuch as they are usually contracted in ways that the patients are ashamed to have known, there are no trustworthy figures as to their prevalence. It may be said safely, however, that gonorrhea is the most common of serious infectious diseases, aside from measles, and that from one-third to one-half of the men in the United States have it at one time or another. Syphilis appears to be about one-fifth as common as gonorrhea, and it is thought that 10 percent of the American population have it sooner or later.

Perhaps one in eight of these cases is contracted accidentally, from germs which infected persons leave on dishes, tools, bath tubs, and in other suitable localities in homes, hotels, restaurants, barber shops, soda fountains, and so on. The remaining cases represent infection through sexual intercourse.

When contracted legitimately, the disease is commonly called innocent: such are the infections of faithful wives by faithless husbands; of children at the time of birth, or before, or after. While these form a large part of the total, yet the greater number of cases is due to illegitimate intercourse, and even the innocent cases go back to such a source originally. So sexual promiscuity is the actual means of the dissemination of all venereal diseases.

Widespread experience in recent years, particularly during the war, has demonstrated more clearly than ever that the main rôle in the dissemination of these diseases is played by the professional prostitute.¹ This had often been denied, and the blame had been

¹ On the other hand, men are the carriers of the disease from infected to non-infected prostitutes, as well as to non-infected wives. Therefore it is idle to attempt, as has often been done, to control venereal diseases merely by the "sanitation" of prostitutes.

placed on the casual offender, largely, it appears, through the not disinterested reiteration by prostitutes themselves of the claim that the professional did not carry disease.

The absurdity of this might have been seen in a moment by anyone with an elementary knowledge of contagion. In fact it is now indisputable that the amount of disease spread by a woman is roughly in proportion to the number of opportunities she has. As the professional prostitute exposes ten men to infection for every one who is exposed by the amateur, the damage the two do is measured pretty nearly by the same ratio. The experience of the Surgeon General's office indicates that from 75 to 90 percent of all infection of men is due to professional prostitutes.

This finding argues a high amount of infection among prostitutes themselves, and the army's experience furnished abundant data to prove it. Those who have been associated with the fight against the venereal diseases have fallen into the habit of assuming, *a priori*, that every woman who is sexually promiscuous is infected; and this assumption is not far from right. Examination of thousands of cases has shown that from 80 to 90 percent of such women are infected with one or other of the venereal diseases, while those who are not themselves definitely diseased may yet spread disease to other persons.

In short, it is now well established that intercourse outside of marriage is almost certain exposure to venereal disease.

The effects on the family may relate primarily to the individual, or to his offspring.

Economically, the venereal diseases are a national burden, the extent of which may be realized when it is borne in mind that on any given day probably from 8 to 10 percent of the population suffer with these infections. The loss of earning power may burden a family severely. A still heavier handicap is imposed when an infected person becomes insane. At least 12 percent of all the insane in the country owe their condition to nothing else, syphilis being the cause of all cases of locomotor ataxia and general paresis. Premature death is another result of syphilis, which, with pneumonia, tuberculosis, and heart disease, is one of the four great

killers in civilization, although it is rare indeed to find a death officially credited to it, for good manners require the doctor to write something else on the death certificate.

The effect on reproduction is more serious, in some respects, because it is in so many cases the innocent wife and child who suffer from the folly of the husband and father. Syphilis is a frequent cause of miscarriages and stillbirths. Of the offspring of syphilitic parents, some 75 percent are destroyed by the disease before birth or within the first year following. Most of the remainder, though they may live to become adult, never know a really well day. Gonorrhea particularly causes barrenness, so that in large groups perhaps half of all absolute barrenness, or of "one child barrenness" where a single child is born and the mother never again conceives, is due to the invasion of the reproductive organs by the gonococcus. A large proportion of the surgical operations performed on the reproductive organs of women are the result of infection with gonorrhea, although they are given some other name.

Sickness, miscarriages, barrenness, insanity, and death are then among the prices the family pays for the existence of venereal diseases. These often have a certain racial value, in so far as they more often affect people who are inferior to the average of the population in intelligence and self-control. But the eugenic progress of the race can be brought about in other ways that do not involve such frightful suffering, particularly of innocent wives and little children. The venereal diseases must go.

This proposal involves no real difficulty, from a strictly scientific point of view. There are no diseases whose whole history is better known than syphilis and gonorrhea. There are few that are theoretically easier, not only to control but to exterminate. That so little has been done in this direction is due to ignorance and prudery.

To get venereal diseases regarded as any other dangerous infectious diseases, proper subjects for strict quarantine and control until a cure has been effected, requires some vigorous exercise of public will-power, but a good deal of progress has already been

made in this direction, dating largely from the World War. During the conflict the American war department applied energetically the measures that common-sense dictated, succeeded in keeping the infection of the army down to a previously unheard-of degree (much lower than prevails in the civil community), and thereby gave a tremendous lesson to the public.

The "American Program" for combating venereal diseases calls for a fourfold attack, comprising law enforcement, medical, educational, and recreational measures. It is based on the fact that these diseases are spread almost wholly through sexual promiscuity, and particularly through commercial prostitution.

No one of these lines of attack, by itself, is sufficient. But if all four of them are pushed intelligently and simultaneously, there is now abundant evidence available to show that results are greater than anyone could have supposed, when the campaign was started 15 or 20 years ago.

VII. INFERTILITY

The increasing prevalence of childlessness in American families is a frequent topic of discussion. Frederick S. Crum found that the percentage, in the old native stock, increased from 1.88 in the last half of the eighteenth century to 8.10 in the decade 1870-1879; while J. A. Hill, analyzing the figures of the 1910 census, showed that one in eight of the native-born wives is childless, as compared with one in five of the Negroes and one in nineteen of the foreign-born. More recent studies have shown that in some large sections of the old white population, at least one wife in five is childless.

Some of this childlessness is voluntary, but an important part of it is not. Many students have supposed that most parents want at least one child, at some time or other, and that the number of voluntary, wholly sterile marriages is therefore small. Every reader will know, in his own circle of acquaintances, a number of married couples who desire children and who would be eugenic parents, but who are not. It has often been guessed that something like 10 percent of all modern, civilized marriages are actually infertile. This guess is probably not far from the truth.

Hundreds of general causes of this infertility have been suggested, from eating too much meat (F. Houssay) to imperfect ventilation of houses (L. Hill), and from the nervous strain of city life, through the spread of twin beds, to the wearing of corsets. All such general causes may play a part, but little progress in prevention is to be expected from blanket diagnoses. Detailed analysis is necessary to untangle the innumerable and involved factors. While any extensive consideration of the biological aspects would be beyond the scope of this book, it is necessary to outline at least a few of the principal lines of investigation, because nothing can prevent the normal functioning of a family more completely than sterility.

Obviously, the childlessness of a family may be the fault either of the man or of the woman. While it is customary unthinkingly

to blame the wife, the responsibility belongs quite as often to her husband. The man should be examined first, because examination is much easier in the male sex. Sterility existing from birth is relatively rare in either sex. In most cases the condition is due to faulty development or unhygienic living.

In men the most frequent single cause of sterility is chronic gonorrhea. Indeed, some students have thought that this is as frequent as all other causes put together. It is declining slowly in importance in the United States, however, as the seriousness of infection with gonorrhea comes to be more widely and fully understood. The common history has been that a man contracts gonorrhea in his youth from some prostitute, treats it with patent medicines, or has it treated by some quack doctor, and, thinking that he has eradicated the germs, actually succeeds merely in driving them more deeply into the reproductive organs, whence they can never be dislodged.

Among other diseases, mumps is a well-known danger in adolescence, when it sometimes attacks the testicles. Malaria, syphilis, tuberculosis, and a number of other infections are in rare instances followed by sterility, the exact nature of which is often obscure.

Alcohol has often been accused of causing sterility in men, but the evidence is contradictory. Lead poisoning is a better attested danger: those exposed to it in their work should bear this in mind. Among modern occupational diseases, the disability that follows exposure to the X-ray is racially one of the most serious. Temporary or permanent sterility is easily acquired in this way. Worse still, the germ-plasm may be so altered as to result in the birth of defective children. Matrimonially, any one who has had much to do with X-rays is what an insurance agent would call a bad risk.

In women the mechanism of reproduction is more complicated than in men, and the possible causes of barrenness are therefore more numerous. Here again gonorrhea plays an important rôle, the germs invading the tubes and ovaries and making conception impossible. In general, all the diseases and poisons mentioned as affecting men may also affect women. Misplacements of the reproductive organs and alterations in their normal functioning,

due to ill health, are often responsible. The internal glands are blamed in a somewhat vague way for a large part of women's sterility. Thyroid diseases and diabetes are both fairly frequent causes of barrenness. Recent students have laid emphasis on infantilism—a condition in which the reproductive organs have not developed normally but have remained in a more or less infantile state. This arrested development is associated with extreme fatness, and also with the Baby Doll type of female beauty.

Experiments in breeding smaller animals have brought to light a cause of infertility which may also play an important part in man. It has been found that certain inherited factors are lethal—that is, in certain combinations they produce, for an unknown reason, an embryo that can not develop but dies in the womb at an early age. The stock example is that of yellow mice. In matings of these with each other, one-fourth of the expected offspring fail to develop more than a few days. These are the ones which received a pure yellow inheritance from both parents (technically, those homozygous for this factor). It happens that a double dose of yellowness is absolutely fatal, although a single dose from the ancestry produces a perfectly normal yellow animal.

Many other cases of the same sort have been found, and it is easy to push the explanation to cover a wide range of happenings. It is probable, as C. B. Davenport and others have urged, that there are certain marriages in which no children are produced, simply because each parent carries inherited factors which, united with those of the other, are lethal in effect. In such a case both parents might be fertile if married to other people.

It is difficult to prove such an explanation in any given case in man, because it is difficult to exclude all other plausible explanations. The marriage of Napoleon Bonaparte and Josephine Beauharnais is cited as an illustration. The latter was a widow who had had children by her first husband, and was therefore not naturally barren. She had no children by Napoleon. He was not sterile, however, for he had children by other women, illegitimately, and also by his second wife, Maria Luisa of Austria. What more natural than to suppose that Napoleon and Josephine were genetically incompatible?

If Josephine had had children by some other man, after her divorce from Napoleon, the case would be stronger. But as this necessary part of the proof is lacking, nothing is proved. She may have become barren after the birth of her children, and before she married Napoleon. She was no more faithful to the marriage vow than he was, and may have contracted gonorrhea. Any one of a score of other possible explanations may apply.

The same difficulty is met in all human cases. The theory of sterility due to genetic incompatibility is well founded, but its detailed application to man is now impossible.

Attention has been called recently to a vitamin, named "fat-soluble E," in the absence of which from the dietary, both sexes become sterile. But since only an infinitesimal amount of it is needed, and since it is abundant in some common foods such as the wheat germ, green leaves (lettuce, etc.) and vegetable oils, it does not appear likely at first sight that it plays an important part in human sterility. Nevertheless, it seems to be established that any marked dietetic or hygienic irregularity that affects the whole body may lower the level of fertility.

Finally, some investigators are convinced that the most frequent cause of sterility in woman arises from her failure (due to ignorance of the art of love on the part of both herself and her husband) to find satisfaction in her love-life.

The results of infertility are personally unfortunate in all cases where the individuals want children. Racially they may be either good or bad, depending on whether or not the quality of the persons affected is such as society wants to see perpetuated.

Gonorrhea, which is possibly the greatest single cause of infertility in modern civilization, attacks those who are probably, on the average, eugenically inferior. Their contribution of children can often be spared. But it is by no means confined to such classes, and it is an evil in so many other ways that a better eugenic substitute can be found for it.

The effects of gonorrhea have probably been particularly significant in the Negro race in the United States. Infection is widespread here. Negroes drafted into the army in 1917-1918 were

found to show seven times as much infection as the whites. The natural fecundity of the Negro is such that except for such checks as this they would have outbred the whites rapidly and eventually made of America another Dark Continent. As it is, they have been losing ground steadily since the Civil War, in comparison with the whites. The campaign against venereal diseases during the last decade has necessarily tended to diminish this cause of infertility among the Negroes, and hence to make them increase in numbers more rapidly. On the other hand, it happens that a widespread emigration of Negroes from southern farms to northern cities has occurred at the same time. As the Negro is less fecund under the latter conditions, perhaps both because of the colder climate and the urban life, the birth-rate of the race has been diminished more than enough to counteract any gain which accrued to it through the reduction in venereal diseases.

In superior homes infertility is an evil from every point of view, and one deserving of more attention than it has had from those interested in the family. It has been too easy in recent years to assume that when such people had no children, it was their own choice, and to ignore the many cases in which infertility of undiscoverable origin left the partners broken-hearted.

The remedies for infertility are so varied that they can not be summed up easily. Most of them may be inferred readily from the nature of the causes outlined above. The extermination of gonorrhea will eliminate the greatest single cause of infertility, while hygiene, physical education, and a better understanding of marriage will deal with many of the others.

One remedy which young men and women can apply to some extent is to marry into fecund families. Francis Galton long ago pointed out that marriage with an only child was likely to result in the extermination of the family; for the fact that the child had no brothers or sisters was some presumptive evidence that it came from a stock whose natural fertility was below par. Marriage into healthy families where there are numerous children is one of the best possible safeguards of continued fertility.

VIII. ILLEGITIMACY

Births outside of wedlock are decreasing steadily in almost all civilized countries. Among white births in the United States, something like one in every 60 is illegitimate, the proportion being higher in cities and lower in the country, and varying, moreover, to a marked degree in different states.

Aside from the faulty vital statistics of many American states, the proportion of foreign-born and of Negro population, especially the latter, influences the figures. Data on Negro illegitimacy are so fragmentary that little definite information can be derived from them; moreover, the social significance of illegitimacy among Negroes is not exactly the same as among whites. I have therefore left Negro illegitimacy out of consideration in this section. So far as one can guess from the figures to be had, there may be some 35,000 illegitimate Negro births in the United States each year. It would probably not be far wrong to say that there are about as many illegitimate Negro as illegitimate white births in a year, although there are only one-tenth as many Negroes as whites in the population. This excess of Negro births doubtless reflects such facts as the smaller amount of criminal abortion in that race, as well as differences in marriage customs.

The sequel of these illegitimate births, as described by social workers, and with some approach to exactness in all too many cases, is that the father either is not disclosed or, if known, is mildly reprobated by his associates, and occasionally forced by the mother's relatives or the law, to make a contribution toward the maintenance of his child. This is almost never more than \$200 a year, for courts are as niggardly in mulcting a man convicted of "bastardy" as they are liberal in mulcting a man convicted of "breach of promise."

On the other hand, the woman in the case is hounded and ostracised, while the child is often given away, a few days after birth, to some one who conveniently lets it die. If it lives, and can not

conceal the secret of its birth, it carries the contempt of its fellow-men through life. It is not strange that such a situation has aroused the reformatory zeal of many sincere and well-meaning persons. And it is not strange, bearing in mind American tendencies in social reform, that these persons have almost uniformly attempted to improve the situation by more laws. The possible effects of such laws in many directions have been almost wholly ignored. Whatever else they may be, they are certainly a long step in the direction of legalized polygamy. The North Dakota law of 1919, one of the most advanced—or retrogressive, according to the point of view—of American statutes on this subject, reads:

“Every child is hereby declared to be the legitimate child of its natural parents, and as such is entitled to support and education, to the same extent as if it had been born in lawful wedlock. It shall inherit from its natural parents and from their kindred heir lineal and collateral.”

The Arizona law of 1921 is similar in terms. Here are laws, expressing more or less accurately the ideal toward which many interested people are looking, that certainly have broad implications and, as will be pointed out in more detail later, would tend to introduce some fundamental changes in the American conception of family life. It is of the highest importance to find out what kind of people make up the small group (say 35,000 mothers and an equal number of babies each year) for whom the traditional ideas about marriage are legally to be set aside.

In the first place, the mothers are mostly young. From one-ninth to one-fifth of them, in various groups studied, are little more than children, i.e., under 18 years of age. About the same proportion of the fathers is under the legal age of majority (K. F. Lenroot). The following table shows the number of illegitimate births (including Negro but excluding stillbirths) per 1000 total births, according to age of mother, in the registration area, 1920 (excluding California and Massachusetts):

10 to 14 years.....	668.6
16 to 19 years.....	113.2
20 to 24 years.....	25.7
25 years and upward.....	35.0

In the second place, the mothers are mostly from economically inferior strata of the population. A study by Emma O. Lundberg and Katharine F. Lenroot, of unmarried mothers in Boston, 1914, revealed the status of 691 whose occupations were reported:

Not gainfully employed.....	98
Clerks and kindred workers.....	68
Semi-skilled workers.....	192
Servants.....	326
All others.....	7

691

Miss Lenroot summarizes other studies by saying, "Available information indicates that the great majority of the mothers are gainfully employed prior to the child's birth, chiefly in domestic service or as semi-skilled factory workers. Almost half the fathers are in the ranks of semi-skilled workers, or clerks and kindred workers." In other words, the economic status of the father averages a little higher than that of the mother. Sometimes, indeed, he is a gentleman, in the worst sense of the word.

In the third place, the mothers are, to a large extent, of inferior mentality. Of 468 in the Boston investigation, as to whose mental condition something was known, 100 were reported as feeble-minded or subnormal, and half a dozen as insane. It can hardly be doubted that many of the 382 described as "normal, so far as known" were at least border-line cases. "These," says Miss Lenroot, "are understatements. Considering together the mental condition of parents and maternal grandparents, only fragmentary evidence being available, it was found that of 2178 children born out of wedlock who were under care of social agencies, at least 19 percent had a heritage in which there was known or probable insanity, feeble-mindedness, or other subnormal or abnormal mental condition." Moreover, the feeble-minded women are more likely to have had several illegitimate children, than are the more normal ones. I have found no definite information about the mentality of the fathers, but their economic status, and the fact that a feeble-minded male is not sexually attractive to most women, make it

probable that the level of intelligence of the fathers averages a little higher than that of the mothers.

In the fourth place, the mothers are of previous bad character, without taking into account the fact of illegitimate maternity, which to some persons would be *ipso facto* evidence. The same holds true of the fathers. Miss Lenroot continues:

"Repeated infractions of the moral code, serious alcoholism, or other anti-social characteristics were reported in the histories of 42 percent of the mothers of children born out of wedlock in one year, for whom social information was available, while the mothers of 54 percent of the children under care of social agencies, and of the same percent of children under care of the state, were so reported. Considering together the character of mother, father, and maternal grandparents for the group of 2178 children under care of social agencies, only 38 percent of the children had parents and grandparents who were of good character, so far as known."

The typical¹ illegitimate child, then, may be said to be the offspring of a young mother of inferior status mentally, morally, and economically; and of a father who is probably a little superior to the mother in age, mentality, and economic status, if not in morals.

The lack of records concerning illegitimate children, except during the first few months of life, makes it impossible to study the character of the offspring of such unions in the way that would be desirable. The frequency of mental defect and congenital syphilis in the population of orphanages, many of whose inmates are of illegitimate birth, doubtless reflects something of the facts; but the principal induction statistically established is the high infant mortality which, in America as in most parts of the world, is two or three times the average. Many erroneous conclusions have been drawn from this fact. One would expect the mortality of illegitimate children to be above the average, because they do not form an average group, but one selected for abundance of natural handicaps,

¹ Undoubtedly the public records are defective, in that the illegitimate mothers of the highest mental and economic status are more likely to succeed in keeping their condition from becoming a matter of record. I have no basis for estimating the amount of this influence.

in addition to the social difficulties of the mother. While some of the high mortality is doubtless due to faulty feeding, consequent on the early separation of mother and child, a much larger part must be due to defective heredity, congenital syphilis, and similar handicaps. It is significant that, excluding diseases directly due to nutrition, the Boston investigation showed the mortality for the ordinary diseases of infancy (closely associated with heredity) to be two or three times the average. Before using the infant mortality rate to work up any more sympathy, the reformers might well publish a comparison with the rate in a really comparable group of legitimate children.

All of these facts about the inferior heredity of illegitimate children as a class are well known, but it has seemed necessary to rehearse them here as a foundation for the very obvious conclusions to which I wish to call attention, namely, that the high infant mortality of these children is, from the narrowest point of view, eugenic, and tends to purify the racial germ plasm of elements which it is much better off without. The ostracism of illegitimate mothers and the callous indifference often manifested toward the fate of their children are social attitudes which have certainly not been built up by any conscious eugenic effort on the part of the race; but their effects are eugenic in a crude, harsh, and drastic way.

If, then, it is desired to modify the present status of illegitimacy in such a way as to save the lives of a larger proportion of these children, it is important that this action, which is eugenically a step backward, be accompanied by some definite eugenic measure to counterbalance it. Otherwise this humanitarian reform, like many others, will leave the race really worse off than before, in regard to the perpetuation of defective strains of germ plasm. This is the direct result; the indirect results on the public attitude toward the home and family may be much more important, though not recognized so easily.

In view of the momentous results that may follow the legislative changes requested on behalf of this small and anti-social part of the population, it would seem natural that these changes be scrutinized

very carefully from a eugenic point of view. But this point of view is precisely the one that is almost always ignored, in any discussion of the subject. I propose to comment very briefly on a few of the salient points in the proposed changes, and for convenience I will take them up under seven heads as classified by the Children's Bureau (1921):

1. Birth registration. It is agreed that full registration of illegitimate and all other births is desirable on every account. The reformers, however, commonly make much of the supposed importance of secrecy. "Together with efforts to secure complete and accurate birth registration must go concern that no record shall be so used that the child's future happiness may be in any way endangered." To this end it is proposed that the details of birth certificates be confidential, to be consulted only upon court order, or by some similar procedure.

Surely, this is going too far, in promoting supposed private interests at the expense of public welfare. For the improvement of sexual selection, it is requisite that details of birth be much more widely known than at present. Birth certificates, and similar information, should be freely accessible to the public for this reason. This is of particular importance in the case of illegitimacy, because of the frequent germinal inferiority, for reasons noted above, of such individuals. Certainly from this point of view, few facts could be of more concern to a young person contemplating marriage, than the fact of the prospective partner's illegitimacy. Yet to safeguard the supposed happiness of one individual, it is proposed to penalize the happiness of unnumbered future generations, not to mention the interests of the state in cutting off inferior lines of descent. Could any proposal be more shortsighted?

The reason for secrecy is, of course, to prevent the innocent child from bearing a stigma. But, after all, is there any reason why the innocent child should not bear a stigma? It is inescapably stigmatized by birth, through inheritance from anti-social, probably mentally defective, and otherwise abnormal parents. The stigma will not be pleasant for the child to bear, any more than would any other infirmity; but the harm done to society by temporarily

concealing this stigma—which, however, can not be so far concealed that it will not appear in the individual's children—is vastly greater.

In this connection a popular line of reform is the euphemistic. The name "bastard" is subject to justifiable protest, because of its connotations. "Illegitimate" is rejected because it is argued that the parentage, not the child, is illegitimate. "Children born out of wedlock," a circumlocution popularized by the Children's Bureau, and "children whose parents have not married each other" (a Norwegian phrase) are objected to as cumbersome and not lending themselves to adjectival use. "Ex-nuptial," the expression used by some writers, is unsatisfactory because the prefix is commonly used in English with an entirely different meaning (cf. ex-president, ex-convict, etc.). Many think that the individual in question should be termed a "natural child," as if, by implication, there is something unnatural about a birth inside wedlock. But the climax is attained by the mealy-mouthed who refer to the bastard as a "love child," thereby recording their view that the product of a furtive mating between some weakly-inhibited reprobate and a feeble-minded servant girl is typically an emblem of love, by contrast with the child born in monogamy. If a new name is to be given to the illegitimate child, surely it must be something very different in implication from these two!

2. The problem of establishing paternity. In order that the lines of descent in the race may be known, the establishment of filiation, though sometimes difficult, is of fundamental importance. If the mother or someone representing her does not take steps to that end, the state should do so. The notorious French law, adopted in the time of Napoleon, stood for a century as the symbol of a non-biological attitude: "The investigation of paternity is forbidden." It was amended in 1912.

3. Responsibility of the father. The extent to which the father should be liable for the support of his illegitimate offspring is a critical problem in this investigation, and one to which reformers have devoted much of their attention, even though for the most part "zeal outruns discretion." A common form of panacea

among legislators has been the adoption of the miraculous formula that an illegitimate child is "the lawful child of the father." But as Ernst Freund points out, this light-hearted action is taken without any clear conception of what it involves, in regard to custody, right of inheritance, and name. In practice, such a provision is unworkable, as I believe the ill-advised North Dakota law of 1919 has shown.

If the father is to be responsible for the support of the child, he must in justice have some control over that child, a fact which reformers often dislike to face, because it is not compatible with their vindictive attitude toward the father and their sentimental attitude toward the mother. A legal father, for instance, is responsible for all the debts of his children. What would happen if this rule were applied to an illegitimate child not subject to paternal control?

Again, what is to be done about paternal responsibility in the case of a promiscuous woman? In such cases it is often impossible to establish paternity by the methods now in vogue, although, as Roswell H. Johnson pointed out (1919), application of the technique of anthropology and genetics would solve most problems. The Norwegian law is logically consistent in making all culpable males responsible, thus giving the child a sort of collective or group father. But such an easy solution does not advance the eugenic interests of the state.

4. Inheritance rights; name. From a eugenic point of view, inheritance of the parental property is of great importance, because of the influence of relative wealth in encouraging or discouraging reproduction on the part of the heirs. I believe it is indicated clearly, for reasons outlined above, that on the average, a man's illegitimate children will be of less eugenic value than his legitimate children. If so, it is not desirable that the illegitimate should inherit equally, and the North Dakota law, which provides for equal shares, is dysgenic.

But in any case, a father in the United States is not legally compelled to bequeath property to his children, as he is in some foreign countries: he can cut off any or all of his legitimate children

without a cent. He can not be compelled to bequeath part of his fortune to an illegitimate child, without a change in the fundamental principles of American law; and if the right of inheritance is dependent on the father's inclination, as it is in fact, then the wording of the North Dakota law is foolish, for the illegitimate child has a "right" to inherit, anyhow, just as a stranger has, provided the testator wishes to name him in his will.

As to the paternal name, one type of thoroughgoing reformer would make it compulsory on the child to take his father's name; most would make it optional. In some ways the interests of eugenics would be better served if every child, by taking his father's name, thereby advertised his genealogy; but this would involve many practical difficulties, and the point is unimportant, since a change of name, legally or otherwise, is easy enough, and the father might often buy off his illegitimate offspring in this respect.

While the interests of the illegitimate child must be given proper consideration, the interests of a legitimate family may often require at least equal consideration. The married mother who bears an illegitimate child is a case in point; the married father may be another, if the admission of his illegitimate offspring would break up a desirable home. Such examples offer a strong argument for the principle that cases of illegitimacy should be dealt with by some agency that can use its discretion, even though such an agency might need the wisdom of Solomon.

5. Care by mother. The question under this head is whether the mother should be obliged to keep her child, at least during the nursing period, or whether, as at present, she may give it away immediately and never hear of it again. Probably this question can be settled in accord with the facts of each individual case.

6. Surrender of child. The question here is, "should the parents of a child born out of wedlock be permitted to surrender the child for adoption, or to any agency or person outside their own family, without the consent of a court of competent jurisdiction or of an authorized state agency?" Social workers generally answer, No.

7. State supervision. This involves the question whether the

state should assume protection and supervision of all children born out of wedlock, by virtue of the fact of such birth, or whether it should intervene only in cases which are neglected or dependent, or in danger of becoming so. Social workers are divided in their views on this point, which involves many considerations that can not be dismissed offhand, or even judged without experience of their practical import. Nevertheless, I venture to suggest that here, as in many other phases of the whole problem, circumstances should govern; and that it is preferable to deal with individual cases before a domestic relations court, or some other agency that has authority to use its own discretion, rather than to attempt by mass legislation to spread on the statute-books iron-clad rules that may be more far-reaching than their framers expect.

Everyone must sympathize with the plight of the child born out of wedlock, and be anxious to see him accorded every mitigation of his lot that is compatible with the welfare of the whole race: but beyond this a eugenicist can not go. The mores of monogamy have been built up, as the product of a sort of natural selection, throughout the evolution of man; they are not to be tampered with except after much more careful study than seems to have been given to the subject by most of those who argue that "every child has a right to have two parents." Moreover, even if the constitution should be amended to declare that there is no stigma attached to illegitimacy, society would continue to stigmatize the illegitimate so long as people feel that there is cause for pride in descent from intelligent, self-controlled, socially-minded ancestors, and cause for humiliation in descent from feeble-minded, weakly-inhibited, anti-social ancestors.

The trouble is that the reformers who want to give every child two parents are guided not by biology, which has already given every child two parents, but by sentiment. Their principal desire is not to further the progressive evolution of the race, but to make things easier for the unmarried mother and to secure better nurture for her child. Both of these ambitions are commendable within limits, but not beyond.

As far as the mother is concerned, it can not be held that the

father is the invariable sinner, and the woman in the case merely a weak and helpless victim of his perfidy. "It has never struck me," Thomas Hardy remarks, "that the spider is invariably male and the fly invariably female." Reformers would remove the stigma from her by making her motherhood just as sacred and honorable as any other kind of motherhood. Apart from the fact that such an end can not be achieved, in the face of the present mores, it may well be asked why all motherhood should be placed on the same basis. There is a big distinction between thoughtfulness and a sense of responsibility, and the kind of motherhood that produces children out of levity, recklessness, and the inability to escape the consequences. I see no reason why the former type should not be honored and the latter stigmatized.

In order to make the two kinds of motherhood more indistinguishable, there is a short cut to human morality much in vogue in some quarters, which consists in getting hold of the man in the case and forcing him to marry the woman, provided, of course, he is not already married to some other woman. Apart from the fact that in many cases this produces loveless marriages, which turn out badly (as I believe experienced social workers all testify), thereby leading to further marital unfaithfulness and increased disintegration of the monogamous ideal, it must be noted that this kind of marriage does not provide for good sexual selection. From a eugenic point of view, it is therefore not to be encouraged.

In addition to mitigating the lot of the unmarried mother, the other object of the reformers is to wipe out the unmerited sufferings of illegitimate children by obliterating the distinction between legitimacy and illegitimacy. This, too, is easier said than done, as I have already pointed out: the illegitimate child is in most cases ineradicably marked at birth, by his inheritance. Is not F. W. Foerster right when he remarks that "Such an artificial leveling is absolutely impossible: the actual difference between the concrete and physically inevitable effect which results from the two kinds of motherhood is so fundamental that it can not be obliterated by any abstract leveling"?

One can not even accept the primary assumption that it is desir-

able that every child should have two parents. Does it not depend on what kind of parents they are? Some children would be better off without any parents, than with those they have. In many cases the present system (if properly administered) of crèches and adoption for illegitimate children may be the best, provided their antecedents are not concealed in such a way that they will burst forth to cause agony later in life at marriage.

It appears, then, from the eugenic point of view, and with reference to conditions in the United States at the present time, that all proposed reforms which have for their object the endeavor to make illegitimate maternity pleasanter and more respectable, and to give illegitimate children a better start in life, must be looked upon with suspicion, if not with actual disfavor. The results can hardly be other than, directly, to increase the number of undesirable citizens in the community, and directly, to break down the ideal of monogamous family life, which would result eventually in the production of a still further increased number of inferior children and the provision of still worse nurture for them, through the disintegration of the monogamous partnership ideal. At present, the only real protection for motherhood is offered by a powerful and authoritative institution such as monogamy, which binds and educates the individual father to the protection of the individual mother and their common children.

A peculiar confusion is evident in the minds of many who deal with this problem. Thus Professor Freund declares: "The view that the interest of the child is the paramount interest to which all other considerations should yield is not only attractive, but socially sound. The view, on the other hand, that in the interest of the institution of marriage the fruit of illicit relations must be penalized and made odious is intrinsically abhorrent."

Now it must be evident to any student of history that marriage is a development, not for the benefit and protection of man, so much as for the benefit and protection of woman and child. Anything, therefore, that safeguards the home is for the interest of mother and infant; while measures, such as many of the proposed reforms in the illegitimacy laws, which, while professing to work

for the welfare of mother and child, actually tend to break down the ideal of the home, are in the long run certain to injure mother and child more than anything else.

It seems to me, therefore, that the illegitimacy problem is being attacked from the wrong side. The number of children born out of wedlock in the United States is so small, in relation to the legitimates, and their eugenic quality is, on the average, so low, that mass legislation intended to benefit them, but actually much more than counterbalancing any good it may do them, by the harm done to the normal and eugenic part of society, is unwise.

The difficulties and injustices arising in actual cases must of course be met as well as is humanly possible; but can not these problems be left largely to the discretion of a domestic relations court, with a minimum of red tape, mandate, hard and fast law, and compulsory judicial procedure? Then, attention can be centered on illegitimacy in a broader way with a view, if not to wiping it out, at least to reducing it to small proportions. Effective measures for doing this are numerous and no longer experimental. They include such familiar procedures as:

Better education of young people, especially in physiology, ethics, and mental hygiene.

More facilities for recreation.

Proper care or segregation of the feeble-minded, particularly women of child-bearing age.

Suppression of prostitution.

Supervision of feebly-inhibited men and women.

Finally, and most important of all, every eugenic measure that will tend to raise the level of the race and reduce the number of feebly-inhibited and feeble-minded persons born, thereby reducing the number of potential illegitimate parents.

IX. ABORTION

Abortion¹ is one of the most important and least-studied of the hindrances to normal family life. In many savage societies it has been a recognized means of limiting the increase of population, and in classical antiquity it was openly tolerated at times. Roman legislators laid down the unscientific principle that the fetus is *pars viscerum mulieris*—a part of the woman's intestines; wherefore she has as much right to have it removed as to have her appendix cut out. Christian doctrine declared the sinfulness of abortion and led to its being regarded as a crime, so that in almost every civilized country it is now a violation of the law, and repugnant to official morals, at least, to have any part in procuring an abortion.

The general relaxation of authority, and the general trend toward materialism and individualism, have resulted, in all civilized countries, in wide and apparently increasing practice of abortion. Obviously, no accurate figures of its frequency can be obtained. In the United States the estimate most frequently quoted is that of W. J. Robinson, who put the number at 1,000,000 annually. Other guesses have ranged from 50,000 to 3,000,000, but most conservative social workers feel that the number can not be less than 250,000 a year (A. W. Meyer). For comparison it may be recalled that there are something less than 2,500,000 births in the United States each year. The number of abortions in Germany has been estimated at from 300,000 to 500,000 a year; in Paris, according to L. Tissier and others, the number of births and of abortions is approximately equal. All of the above figures, it must be insisted, are mere guesses, even though the best guesses avail-

¹ The word is here used to apply only to abortions that are induced artificially. Spontaneous abortions occurring before about the seventh month are usually called miscarriages; those at a later period stillbirths. This is popular usage: physicians often refer to any early miscarriage as an abortion, without implying anything criminal.

able. Without laying particular weight on any of them, one may say with some confidence that the number of abortions on both sides of the Atlantic is large and that it is probably increasing.

There is reason to believe that most of the abortions are performed by licensed physicians, although midwives and nurses also contribute. E. B. Reuter mentions court records purporting to show that there are at least 2,000 persons in New York City who make this their profession, while a writer in *Hygeia* (November, 1924) states that the coroner's office of Chicago has a list of over 400 physicians and midwives known to be doing criminal abortions. Perhaps one case in a thousand is prosecuted, but even then a conviction is seldom obtained. The victim has every reason for not wanting to testify, and if she does take the stand, she is unable to give an exact account of what happened. Moreover, it is merely her word against that of the abortionist, since there are usually no other witnesses available; and physicians dislike to testify for a number of reasons, one of which is that the defense attorneys often make them uncomfortable.

To the number of abortions induced by specialists must be added those (an unknown but not a small proportion of the total) induced by the women themselves. These are usually by means of drugs, of which popular superstition supposes several to be effective. In addition, thinly-disguised advertisements offering "female pills" or powders "to restore suppressed menstruation" are to be seen on all sides.

Inasmuch as the signs of pregnancy are not infallible during the earlier months, and suppression of menstruation, which is the evidence usually accepted by women, may be due to numerous other causes, many women who are not pregnant become the victims of abortionists. J. R. Spinner, who says there are thousands of such cases of "imaginary abortion" in Germany each year, has recorded 100 of which the details were known. In this series, 45 percent of the operations resulted in the death of the woman.

Both unmarried and married women contribute to the number of abortions, but physicians seem to be generally agreed that most

are among married women. In the group of 826 married college graduate women who replied (anonymously) to the questionnaire of Katherine Bement Davis, 92 admitted having had a total of 144 abortions (some of them, however, by order of a physician to save their lives). The admissions were as follows:

NUMBER OF WOMEN ADMITTING ABORTIONS	NUMBER OF ABORTIONS
63	1
19	2
5	3
2	4
1	5
1	7
1	8

The principal effects are: on the woman, sometimes death, often protracted illness and ensuing barrenness (not to mention expense), inflammations, infections, persistent bleeding, repeated spontaneous abortions thereafter; and perversion of the feelings normally associated with motherhood and child love; on society, the loss of an equivalent number of children. If, as is probable, people who practice abortion average inherently inferior to the rest of the population in some important respects, the loss of their offspring is not an unmixed evil. But the same gain can be got better in other ways.

More than perhaps any other problem concerning the family, abortion is viewed through a fog of emotion. On the one hand are those to whom the very thought is abhorrent, to whom abortion is merely murder, and who regard even a serious discussion of its causes and consequences as wicked. On the other hand are those who, having attempted to emancipate themselves from all authority, regard abortion as a natural form of birth control. They assume as a matter of course that a woman must be absolute mistress of her own body, and consider that if she desires to procure an abortion, no one else has a right to say anything about it. These seem to think that having an abortion performed is comparable, both physically and ethically, to having a tooth pulled.

The second view seems to have been gaining ground, particularly in Europe, where the subject has been discussed more openly than in the United States. As long ago as 1905, a Woman's Congress in Germany adopted a resolution demanding that abortion be punishable only when effected by another person against the wish of the pregnant woman herself; and the Social Democratic Party in that country—the largest political group—has included in its platform the demand that the laws against abortion be much modified, if not wholly abrogated.

As this point of view has been spreading steadily in America, it is of the highest importance that everyone interested in the conservation of the family examine it and decide for himself how far it is well taken. Although many facts that would be desirable are not available, one can draw some sound inferences from a few simple biological principles.

For the sake of concreteness, I shall proceed by listing and examining the arguments offered in favor of unrestricted abortion. Most of these have been summarized conveniently by a German woman physician, Käte Frankenthal. I print a synopsis of her views in italics, to distinguish them from my comments. She argues:

1. *That existing laws against abortion represent merely the expression of a legislature dominated by men and religion, and that they are now out of date, as women, who have achieved political freedom, can no longer submit to dictation from such sources. If freedom of women means anything, it means freedom to abort. The law should conform to the wishes of a majority of the population. In this case the women are the only ones to be considered. The vast majority of them want the right to abort. Vox populi, vox dei!*

In answer one might challenge a number of the premises stated, but it is sufficient to say that to repeal every useful law which happens to oppose the convenience or desire of a large class would lead quickly to anarchy. A great number of people want to smuggle foreign purchases through the customs, and want to evade the income tax; but to abolish these sources of revenue for that reason would be simple-minded. The question to be determined is

whether or not freedom to abort is desirable. This is far too big a problem to be decided merely by the vote of those most stridently interested.

2. The law against abortion is not obeyed, therefore it should be repealed, as its maintenance brings the whole principle of law-enforcement into contempt.

This argument is no stranger to prohibitionists in the United States. It is fallacious. If the law is worth keeping, it should be enforced. Of course, it is not to be looked on as the only reliance against the prevalence of abortion. It is merely one of numerous measures which aid to diminish the number of abortions. There is no doubt that the presence of the law is a deterrent to many women. If unrestricted abortions are not desirable, then this deterrent, among others, is valuable, and should be reënforced rather than removed.

3. The morality of a people must be based on more solid ground than fear of punishment.

This has a familiar sound.² It is all too true. But it has generally been found desirable, nevertheless, to keep laws against murder, rape, burglary, and the like—and to enforce them, so far as possible. Why not repeal them, in order to have public morality and order rest on more solid grounds than fear of punishment?

4. There are many abortions that ought to be performed in the

² Fear deserves a footnote. It is continually urged by reformers that society should not try to make people good through fear. Fear of pregnancy, fear of gonorrhea, fear of Mrs. Grundy, fear of the unwritten law, fear of ostracism—all such motives for self-control are declared to be low and degrading. Granted that fear is neither the "highest" motive to which appeal can be made, nor the most effective in many cases, it yet has its place, among others, at the present time. To discard it until other and surer means of control are available would be folly. The child is taught first to fear fire: otherwise he might easily come to disaster before he was old enough to know that fire, properly handled, is a valuable servant and friend. Many children die of old age without ever getting beyond the mental horizon of childhood. Fear is still one of the best agencies for controlling such persons. It has been so roundly condemned in recent years by New Thought cults of religion and pseudo-psychology that it is in danger of being regarded in a false light. Evil as some fears are in many cases, yet a normal, biological fear has its place, and an essential one, in the world.

interests of the state much more than those of the woman involved (cases of bad heredity, poverty, and the like). Freedom would permit these to be performed, to the state's benefit. Under the present law, the state suffers.

This is nonsense. One may also argue that there are many tenement houses in New York City which ought to be burned down, and that it would be to the state's interest to have them thus removed. But there are laws against arson, nevertheless, and they are enforced. There are (a) greater evils connected with the proposed remedy, than the good it would produce; and (b) there are other ways of getting the job done, that are less harmful than to throw open the gates to all abortion.

5. *The danger from abortion is imaginary, or at worst lies in the fact that it is performed furtively, by incompetent quacks. Under proper conditions, when the best members of the profession were encouraged to handle such cases, an abortion would be a routine minor operation. Far more serious surgical cases are handled daily by the hundred without grave results.*

Such ignorance of biology comes strangely from a physician. While there is usually nothing except danger of an infection in the removal of an appendix, for example, the removal of a growing fetus is particularly difficult. The whole object of the fetus—to speak figuratively—is to avoid the danger of being removed. Hence it is attached to the wall of the womb by a special organ, the placenta, that is particularly well adapted to holding on, and particularly resistant to being dislodged. If it were not so, the race would probably have become extinct hundreds of thousands of years ago, through excessive miscarriage.

The placenta grows into the wall of the womb in a remarkably intimate way, thrusting innumerable root-like projections into this wall. The tissue around them breaks down, and the maternal blood soaks directly through a thin membrane of the placental tissue, thus getting into the circulation of the fetus. The danger incurred in an abortion is either (a) to dislodge the whole placenta and start a hemorrhage that will cause death, or else (b) to leave part of the placental tissues in the womb, thus starting blood

poisoning and causing death. Those who think that the premature separation of the fetus from the womb is a slight matter are not well informed.

6. *There are some women who simply ought not to bear children. Abortion is an absolute necessity for them.* [This is an amplification of her point No. 4.] *Such cases include married women whose health will not permit them to be mothers, women the victims of rape, and innocent young girls seduced by dissolute men of mature age.*

In answer to this it may be said that there are other ways of preventing childbirth than resort to an abortionist.³ If a woman's health is such that she can not bear children, it is possible for her to be rendered permanently sterile. Moreover, both law and medical ethics justify abortion to save a woman's life, and many such operations are performed annually. The argument involving rape is largely fictitious, for it seems to be well established that conception rarely follows real rape by violence. Through fear and shock, however, the victim may miss a menstrual period, and therefore suppose that she is pregnant. The innocent young girl seduced by an older and dissolute man arouses pity; but what of the innocent young boy seduced by an older and dissolute woman?

³ There are some amusing contradictions in the attitudes of those who defend abortion. American Birth Control propagandists, for tactical reasons, usually lay great emphasis on the appalling evil of abortion, representing that their panacea would cure this as well as all other maladies of society. But as the same propagandists are often believers in the desirability of free abortion, the weight of their testimony is somewhat diminished. Occasionally one of them forgets to be politic, and speaks right out in meeting. Thus at the First American Birth Control Conference (New York, 1921), André Tridon declared, in the course of a formal address: "I also believe one thing, that the meaning of the perfectly insignificant operation called abortion should be made clear to all women who have been mothers several times, and who are planning to have no more children. As I said before, the operation is extremely insignificant, much less dangerous than having your nails manicured, or having your face shaved in a more or less antiseptic barber shop. . . . You may tell me, of course, that we will be breaking the law by doing so. Well, there was a famous man who said that in many cases the law was an ass. . . . When you are feeling that you are breaking the law not to further your own personal private happiness, but the happiness of the community, then breaking the law is not a crime, but a public duty."

Chivalry usually leads to emphasis on the former case, and no mention of the latter. Is the woman in the second case also to have the benefit of the abortionist's services? If not, who is to draw the line?

So much for Dr. Frankenthal's principal lines of argument. All of them are specious. Turning to the broader aspects of the problem, one must ask just what abortion really is, from a biological point of view.

Advocates of abortion usually assume that it is on the same level as the prevention of conception. It involves the elimination from the mother's body of a fertilized egg-cell which is wholly incapable of living under any other conditions. It can not be called the destruction of life, but only of potential life; and potential life is being destroyed by wholesale, on all sides, every day, in the ordinary course of nature.

Such a naïve point of view is untenable.

The fact is that in the ovaries of the human female *in infancy* there are several hundred thousand undeveloped egg-cells. By the time of puberty most of these have already degenerated and, presumably, been absorbed by the body. Perhaps 30,000 or 40,000 are left. Of this great number only 15 or 20 at the most (usually only three or four) will ever be fertilized and develop into babies. Some of the others are discharged, each month or oftener, and expelled from the body. The remainder either die with their carrier, or degenerate after the menopause. There is thus a great waste, so to speak, of egg-cells, constantly taking place, and not to be prevented by any known means. (The waste is vastly greater in the male.)

Once the egg-cell is fertilized, and implants itself in the wall of the womb, it is on another basis. It is then a living creature in a different sense. It will never be wasted or destroyed, under normal conditions, but will develop into a child. It is not viable—that is, not capable of living alone if removed from the womb—until somewhat late in its development. The period is usually placed at the fifth month. But viability varies in each case. Moreover, the exact age of the fetus is never known with certainty.

He who would kill it and consider himself guiltless because it was not viable is therefore walking along a very narrow line, if there be any line at all.

Dr. Frankenthal herself admits this. The measure championed by the German Social Democratic Party proposed that abortion should be unpunished only if performed during the first three months of the fetal life. This, as Dr. Frankenthal says, is purely arbitrary, therefore unreasonable, even if the age could be known exactly—and it can not. She might have added that expert abortionists prefer not to operate in less than three months, for the chances of success are not so good.

Closer consideration will show that any line of demarcation is unwarranted. Why draw the line at three months, since the fetus is no more capable of living alone at four than at three? Why draw it at five, since, strictly speaking, the fetus is no more capable of living alone at seven or eight than at five? It can in any case exist, after it comes into the world, only with the greatest care and assistance. No baby ever born could live for a day unaided. Logically, then, there seems to be no more reason to permit the murder of a child before delivery than after delivery.

Indeed, the argument may be extended still farther, with full justification. A child two or three years old can not live without the assistance of other people. It is as wholly incapable of an independent, unaided existence as is a three months' fetus. It has to be cared for, protected, and fed; and whether this care, feeding, and protection take place within the mother's body or outside it is a secondary consideration. If abortion is legal, why not the slaughter of a child at any time before it is able to protect itself and manage its own affairs?

This has been the logic of many savage peoples, and of many others who were well up in the scale of civilization, and who did not hesitate to destroy infants to keep down the population. After the introduction of Christianity in the Roman Empire, several centuries of vigorous effort were necessary, before child exposure and child murder could be made formally illegal—much less abolished.

The fact is that the attempt to set a limit, before which abortion is no crime, is a survival of the savage's idea that life does not exist in the womb until it can be felt—that is, until the period of quickening, about four months after conception. Prior to that time, it was supposed that the fetus was not alive. This superstition is retained in the old English common law, but it is surprising to find it adopted by modern writers.⁴ Needless to say, the fetus is just as much endowed with life one day after conception, as it is at the date of quickening.

There is another biological argument against interference with the developing fetus. It is not a parasite, growing at the expense of the mother's body, and to be removed like a cancer. It is an independent living organism which exists in symbiosis with the mother—that is, each one gives to as well as receives from the other. Both benefit from the arrangement. The mother supplies principally food; the child, on its part,—even if but a few months from conception—returns the favor by supplying various internal secretions to its mother. The hullabaloo of Birth Control agitators has almost obscured the fact, in the minds of many women, that pregnancy is a beneficial experience to the mother. Normally, it increases her well-being, physically and mentally. Abortion terminates this mutually profitable symbiosis. It is unfair to the mother as well as to the child.

In addition to mother and child, there is the father to be considered. Is he to have any say about an abortion? The advocates seem to give him a short shrift. All he can do, says Dr. Frankenthal, if his wife will not let her children live, is to leave her and go to some other woman. On the other hand, if he himself demands

⁴ Superstitions regarding pregnancy die hard. Some uncivilized races still hold to the notion that a baby possesses no individual existence (or perhaps no soul) until after it has been put to the breast and taken its first food; hence they feel that the killing of a newborn babe before it has nursed is not murder, but a reasonable form of birth control. Again, the superstition of "prenatal culture" or "maternal impressions" has had quasi-scientific support in civilized countries up to recent times. Now, however, it is generally relinquished by physicians to midwives, by midwives to old grannies, and by old grannies to Doctor Marie C. Stopes.

abortions, and his wife wants to bear children, she can not honorably oppose his wishes—all she can do is to leave him and bring up her children alone. It is doubtful whether such even-handed justice will gain many adherents.

Most advocates of abortion lack the courage to follow their own arguments to a logical conclusion. Instead of giving every woman free rein in the matter, they would set up some kind of a tribunal to pass on each case and decide whether or not abortion is permissible in the premises.

Such a proposal has no merit. Under ordinary circumstances no board of arbitrators can properly be given the right to take life—and abortion amounts to exactly that. A plausible plea can often be made in favor of allowing some woman to have an abortion performed, but it would be highly unsafe to give any tribunal power to weigh such cases and pronounce judgment of death.

Ordinary murder seems to me to furnish a close parallel. No tribunal has the right to mark out any person for slaughter, and when such a right is assumed by mobs, revolutionary committees, or secret organizations, it is regarded as a menace to society. The man who kills must take the responsibility on his own shoulders. His action may afterward be approved. He may have killed in self-defense, or in defense of wife or child, and no one will condemn him. But he must expect, in advance, to be held to account for his actions. The time for him to exercise discretion is before he pulls the trigger.

True, a judge or jury may sentence a criminal to death. If so, he has had his day in court. He has been tried, heard in his own defense, had the power to summon witnesses, had the protection of procedure that is devised expressly to prevent the conviction of an innocent man; and after all this a jury of his peers has found him guilty of capital offense against society. Even then, he has the right of appeal.

Is the same process to be applied to an unborn child? If so, what is the charge against him?

Even this time-honored procedure is gradually falling into disfavor, and it is probable that capital punishment will be a thing

of the past in civilized countries in the near future. More and more, public opinion is coming to think that when the state itself commits murder, it is destroying some of its most precious ethical values.

And certainly any state that permits the promiscuous murder of unborn children is inevitably destroying the sentiments and feelings on which its very existence depends.

What, then, is the way out? As usual, there is no panacea. On the one hand, every measure that tends to cut down extra-marital intercourse will cut down the demand for abortions. On the other hand, every measure that tends toward the readjustment of the birth-rate, and toward a better public understanding of the place of children in life, will likewise curtail the demand for abortions. Beyond that, an awakening to the tremendous proportions of the evil, and a vigorous campaign of law-enforcement, are needed.

X. INADEQUATE REPRODUCTION IN SUPERIOR FAMILIES

1. *Who are the superior?* No one denies that some people are worth more to the community, and to themselves, than are others. Not only the genius, the inventor, the statesman, the prophet; but the hard-working father and mother, who enjoy life, help others to do the same, contribute something worth while to the world, and bring up a good-sized family of healthy and useful children—all these persons are generally recognized as good citizens, worthy of honor.

On the other hand there is a very different class, even though a limited one, comprising the feeble-minded, the degenerate, the physically defective, the "born criminal," and the like. It is generally agreed that society could get along without them, and that in most instances both they and the nation would be better off if they had not been born.

While there are always voices raised in protest when the eugenicist speaks of superior persons, it thus appears that the existence of some differences is never denied, even though no two persons agree as to the exact limits of the classes that contain the desirable and the undesirable citizens.

For the present purpose superior people will be defined as those who have, to a greater degree than the average, inherited the capability of (a) living past maturity, (b) reproducing adequately, (c) living happily, and (d) making contributions to the productivity, happiness, and progress of society. Emphasis is laid on the inborn capability, because there may be some who are born with such capability but who through no fault of their own do not achieve success: they are yet to be classed among the eugenic superiors. On the other hand there are those who, though "born to the purple," are not born with the traits above mentioned. Regardless of their rank and wealth, they are to be classed as eugenically inferior.

It is not necessary here to go into further detail, or to make any invidious distinctions. If the above-mentioned traits tend to go together (they do, in fact, to a marked extent) then by definition something like one-half of the American nation—i.e., all above the average—is to be regarded as superior, in varying degree.

2. *What is adequate reproduction?* A common-sense view would suppose that the birth-rate of this group should, in the interest of the race, be at least enough to maintain its own numbers from generation to generation. Most of the progress made in any country is due to the superior half of its population. Within limits, the amount of progress will depend directly on the proportion of superior people. If the percentage falls, the progress of the race will begin to slow down. If the percentage rises, the race will make strides ahead more rapidly than ever before. One might at least hope, therefore, that the superior part of the population would have enough children to keep from dying out. This would require, as shown in Part I, that each married pair have at least four children, or bring at least three to maturity.

The number of superior people in each generation is made up primarily of those born in that class, and secondarily, of those who have come up from the ranks, who have emerged from the horde of unskilled workers (urban or rural) to display talents far beyond those of their original associates. It has been supposed by some writers that the number of those in the class last-mentioned is practically unlimited, and that nothing more is needed than to give them a chance; to develop education, promote social justice, and thereby produce, from any walk of life whatsoever, as many leaders as may be needed in each generation. By this hypothesis, it would make little difference whether the present group of superiors reproduced itself or not, for if it did not, it could be replaced easily from the great reservoir of undeveloped talent at the bottom of the social order.

Such a hypothesis is untenable. The reasons, which are set forth at length in *Applied Eugenics* and elsewhere, can not be summarized here further than to say that it does not square with the facts of heredity. But granting for the sake of argument that

proper education and a square deal had unlimited power to raise men from the depths to the heights, yet this would not be an adequate substitute for the reproduction of those already on the heights; for it will be generally admitted that the homes and family circles of the latter are, if not better, at least easier places in which to develop good character than are the lowest types of congested and insanitary tenements. Thus on any hypothesis it is desirable that those who have demonstrated themselves to be superior should reproduce. Every effort should be made to draw from the "submerged tenth" the utmost of human ability that it contains; but this effort can not possibly make it less desirable for the present prosperous and efficient members of the community to bear children.

It is, moreover, obviously desirable that the most highly-endowed bear the most children, and that the least highly-endowed bear the fewest, if there are to be differences in the birth-rate.

These are elementary biological facts that seem self-evident, yet it is surprising how often they are ignored in discussions of population.

3. *What is the present reproduction of the superiors?* It is impossible to answer this question directly, since there are no figures applying directly to superiors in the sense in which the word is here used. But by examining the birth-rate in a number of different groups, one can see something of the movement of evolution.

It will be found that the old native white stock is dying out rapidly in the northeastern states, where it is being replaced by the children of more recent immigrants; and that, on the whole, the increase of population comes from people living in the country (above all, in the west and south) and from the poorer part of city populations everywhere. The more well-to-do in all cities have lower birth-rates, and usually do not perpetuate themselves.

Thus there is a constant drain of people, in each generation, from the farms to the cities, where they die without having left sufficient representatives to take their places. At the same time there is a constant rise of the abler residents of the city's worst

districts, into affluence and better residential districts, where they likewise die without having left children to fill their places.

The result of these broad trends is that an important part of the natural ability of the country is used up in each generation. American cities now contain roughly half of the entire population of the nation. The successful, well-to-do part of the city population dies without leaving enough children to fill the ranks. The disappearance of this element from the nation is, however, prevented because the poorer districts of the cities, and the remaining half of the population living in the country, send forward each year a batch of new recruits.

Two questions are thus presented. (a) Is it desirable that the most productive part of the urban population should die off? (b) Is the reservoir, in the lower urban and the rural population, which is now making up the deficit, inexhaustible; or will the best elements in this reservoir gradually be exhausted, too, until only the dregs are left?

The first question can be answered without hesitation. It is a national calamity that the part of the population which does the most for progress should, in each generation, perish. Although this section by no means contains all of the eugenically superior (as defined above), and does contain many who are inferior; yet it contains a larger proportion of eugenically superior than do the lowest strata—the “submerged tenth” or perhaps even the “submerged third.”

The second question has been more debated. It can not be disputed seriously, however, that it is possible in time to exhaust this or any other human reservoir, and that the average quality will tend to be lower each year.

Turning from these broad and general considerations to a few details, the discussion will here be limited to members of the white race in America.

College graduates form a group which is distinctly superior to the average in mental ability and family background. Neither men nor women have a birth-rate high enough to reproduce the group. So far as is known, however, the birth-rate of college

men is about twice as high as that of college women. For example, the number of children¹ per graduate is, at

Yale.....	1.99
Harvard.....	1.71
Syracuse (men).....	1.66
Vassar.....	0.90
Wellesley.....	0.86
Syracuse (women).....	0.83
Bryn Mawr.....	0.37
Wellesley (honor scholars).....	0.20

The number of children per *married* graduate is, at

Yale.....	2.57
Harvard.....	2.51
Syracuse (men).....	2.06
Vassar.....	1.82
Wellesley.....	1.56
Syracuse (women).....	1.46
Bryn Mawr.....	0.84
Wellesley (honor scholars).....	0.57

Among college professors and men of science, the two-child family has been virtually standardized.

A study published late in 1924 by the Bureau of Census gives the number of children that had been borne to fathers aged 45 to 49 in various occupations. The age of the fathers makes it certain that the family is complete or nearly so. The average size of family, in groups where more than 1,000 births altogether were reported, is given in the tabulation on page 130.

Most of the people represented in these groups are no doubt of good stock, the perpetuation of which is desirable, and it is gratifying to note that, so far as this fragmentary investigation represents the entire situation, they are more than perpetuating themselves. But it will be noted that none of these furnishes the bulk of the leadership of the nation. Among the 1000 leading American men

¹ I give the gross birth-rate in every case, since the child mortality is in some cases not known. If the net birth-rate (which is the significant one, eugenically) could be given, it would of course be lower. See Paul Popenoe, 1917.

OCCUPATION	NUMBER OF BIRTHS REPORTED IN 1923	NUMBER OF CHILDREN LIVING IN 1923	TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN BORN UP TO 1923
Coal mine operatives.....	2,679	6.6	8.1
Farm laborers.....	3,074	6.0	7.2
General laborers.....	10,069	5.8	7.2
Semi-skilled operatives.....	3,602	5.4	6.4
Carpenters.....	2,048	5.4	6.2
Mechanics.....	1,622	5.0	5.9
Retail and wholesale dealers.....	3,252	4.8	5.5
Other merchants, miscellaneous.....	1,243	4.0	4.5

of science, there is not one son of a day laborer. It takes 48,000 unskilled laborers to produce one man distinguished enough to get in *Who's Who*, while the same number of Congregational ministers produces 6,000 persons eminent enough to be included in that work of reference.

Bootblacks, who had the highest birth-rate next to coal miners, in the above study, had just about twice as many children as did the bankers whose shoes they shined. Dentists, physicians, and surgeons had three children apiece, as did architects, artists, chemists, lawyers, judges, musicians, technical engineers, actors, designers, inventors, and brokers. As there are many unmarried or childless men in the latter occupations, it is evident that these professions are not reproducing themselves. Yet these and similar groups are the ones from which a number of children much larger than the average would be of particular benefit to the race.

4. *What are the immediate causes of the low fecundity of the superior?* Among them are:

(a) Late marriages. While the average age at marriage in the United States, as in most other civilized countries, has shown a slight tendency to drop in recent decades, the age at marriage of the most highly educated part of the community shows a tendency to increase, the period of preparation being lengthened steadily. Many professional schools now require a bachelor's degree for entrance. The graduate of such a school must establish himself in business after he gets his diploma; he can rarely hope to marry

before the age of 30 and, with the stress of competition, the age tends to be pushed up towards 40. The unskilled laborer, on the other hand, can marry as soon as he reaches maturity. Indeed, his earning power may be greater at 20, in the vigor of youth, than at 40.

(b) Fewer marriages. In the nation as a whole, the percentage of marriages is rising slightly, but in the higher ranks there is a tendency to bachelorhood, which leaves one-fourth of the men college graduates permanently unwed. The marriage rate of college women is more variable, and uniformly lower. In some of the coeducational colleges of the middle west it reaches 60 percent, or even 70 percent, while in other institutions, including all the separate women's colleges of the east, and such widely different coeducational universities as Stanford and Syracuse, it is below 50 percent.

(c) Fewer children per marriage. This is the great cause of the falling birth-rate. Is it voluntary or involuntary?

Although the number of sterile marriages has increased steadily for many decades, they are not the principal source of the fall. It is a matter of common notoriety that people are nowadays having fewer children than their parents did, because they do not want too many children, and because they take deliberate and more or less effective means to prevent having children. Studies at the University of Wisconsin by E. A. Ross and at the University of California by S. J. Holmes showed that the present students come from three-child families, while their grandparents had five or six children each.²

Of 1,000 married women above the average in education, who answered the questionnaire of Katherine Bement Davis, three-fourths stated that they used contraceptive methods. It is interesting to note that those who used such methods had both more pregnancies and more living children than those who never used any contraceptive measures. Of the women who "took no precau-

² J. McKeen Cattell has pointed out the statistical reasons why people always come from larger families than they themselves have. The above figures can not, therefore, be taken quite at their face value.

tions," none had had more than seven pregnancies, and only 12 had had more than five. Of the women who used contraceptives, six had had eight pregnancies each, two had had nine, two eleven, while one woman reported 12 and another 13 pregnancies—an eloquent testimonial to the efficiency of Birth Control! Those (average age 37 years) who had used contraceptives had had 2.5 pregnancies and 1.93 children each, while those (average age 41 years) who had never used such measures had had 1.65 pregnancies and 1.31 children each. These paradoxical results may indicate to some extent that the women who did not use contraceptives were those who had less need of them, because of a natural tendency to barrenness. But the number of cases in which there had not even been one pregnancy was slightly greater among those who used contraceptives, than among those who did not.

While all the factors that have been mentioned in Section 7 enter into the declining birth-rate, it is not disputed, I believe, that voluntary limitation of pregnancies is the chief factor.

5. *What are the indirect causes of the low fertility of the superior?* They are largely associated with life in great cities, and they have been found in every civilization that built great cities. They represent the interaction of biologic, economic, national, social, religious, and ethical influences, which operate first on the frequency and manner of sexual intercourse and secondly on the changing of its natural result. From this formula it will be clear that no simple explanation can be given.

Biological causes of the lower birth-rate in the city may include the general unwholesome conditions of city life, the higher nervous tension, too poor or too rich diet, greater prevalence of venereal diseases, greater frequency of abortion and resulting barrenness, and the like. These are unquestionably of less importance than the social and economic factors. Broadly, the birth-rate may be said to vary inversely with social position. The latter is a function of revenue and education. Hence the birth-rate is likely to be lowest where revenue is highest and education most specialized.

But such generalizations convey little meaning. It is more profitable to analyze some of the causes in detail, even at the risk of losing a certain amount of perspective.

For the present purpose, the broadest distinction that can be made in society is that between hand-workers and brain-workers. While the classes are not sharply distinct, and there is a continual transfer from one to the other, popular usage recognizes the distinction as valid, and boys and girls starting out in life are often much concerned as to whether they will land in one or the other class—whether they will have dirty hands or white collars.

Among the poorer hand-workers there is little voluntary limitation of the size of family. The people in this class do not know how to limit their families, and sometimes do not care a great deal about learning, because they do not feel the burden of a fairly large family as keenly as people in the higher classes. The child is not such a handicap; it goes to work at an early age, and contributes something to the family. Moreover, this class always contains a certain proportion of the thoughtless and improvident and sub-normal, who would not exercise the restraint necessary to prevent childbirth, even if they knew how.

Among the more intelligent hand-workers, the skilled laborers and trades union members, there is more widespread limitation of families. Many of these people want to keep down the number of laborers in the population, thereby hoping to raise wages. Others want to give their children better opportunities than they themselves had, which means that the child will have a longer education and probably not make any financial return to the parents before his own marriage. Others are ambitious to get ahead themselves, and do not want the trouble or expense of children.

Passing to the brain-workers, one finds that voluntary restriction of the size of family is nearly universal. Among the merely well-to-do, the ambition of the father frequently causes this: he is immersed in his work, determined to forge ahead, and leaves every detail of home life to his wife; or he wants all his money to put into his business. The wife, on her side, is often a climber; the couple is determined to have a better automobile than it can afford; to keep up appearances; children interfere in many ways with these efforts, consequently they are not born. Many wives want some sort of "career;" many others are of the purely parasitic type;

while even those who do want children find city life particularly unfavorable for bringing up a family of the normal size; expenses excessive on every side and conveniences—even a place to live—hard to obtain. Desire to travel, to acquire “culture,” and other distractions likewise tend to keep down the birth-rate, so that this class rarely bears enough children to maintain its own numbers.

Above the level of the well-to-do are the wealthy, practicing birth control almost universally, conspicuous exceptions being some of the enormously rich families who desire to found “dynasties.” In a study of 600 millionaires, P. Sorokin found the average family to consist of four or five children. Ambition and love of ease are prevailing motives among the wealthy; riches bring cares, opportunities for selfish enjoyment—in short, a multiplicity of competing interests, to which children are sacrificed. Both men and women are usually insatiable climbers; the girls are too often brought up as pampered parasites, educated at “finishing” schools and women’s separate colleges; their ideals are normally impossible of attainment, and by the time they are ready to settle down and marry some man in moderate circumstances, sharing with him the trials as well as the joys of bringing up a family, they have often passed the age when marriage is possible.

This class, like many others, rarely reproduces its own numbers. It is continually dying out at the top and being replaced from below. This condition is in a way particularly unfortunate, because its example is so widely admired and followed by people in classes below it.

6. *How can conditions be changed to favor the production of larger families among the superior?* If the foregoing analysis is in large part correct, it is obvious that a new attitude toward reproduction is required, with the reconstruction of features of society that favor the present wrong attitudes.

It is no simple matter to bring about such a change. It means innumerable readjustments, large and small. Much of Part III will be devoted to this problem. Here it is sufficient to point out a few lines along which one might hope for immediate progress.

Obviously a thoroughgoing reconstruction of education is neces-

sary. This must (a) prepare young people to be intelligent parents and (b) make it feasible, especially for superior young men, to earn enough to maintain a family, at an earlier age than is now often possible. All phases of education directly concerned with the home must be handled in a very different manner from the present.

Economic fair play is needed, so that income may be more proportionate to real worth. Taxation may be revised to this end.

Most important of all is a change in attitude toward reproduction, on which Roswell H. Johnson has been insisting effectively for many years. Let honor be given where it is due, and pity or contempt where they, on the other hand, are deserved.

Faulty education of men is the reason for the celibacy of many young women. Vigorous effort must be made to correct it. On the other hand are all superior single women wholly to be excused for their situation? It seems probable that many of them have deliberately allowed themselves to fall into a rut, where they make no marriageable acquaintances, or where they absorb an anti-social misanthropy that too often cloaks an inferiority complex based on their celibacy. The healthy and intelligent married woman who could have a normal family and who has only a child or two is, in most cases, pulling back on the wheels of racial progress. There was much talk during the World War of the heroism and nobility of those women who gave their sons to death: is there not an occasional word to be said for those who give sons, and daughters, to life? If, on the other hand, the husband is responsible for limitation of births beyond necessity, double condemnation must be his, since he has not even the trouble of bearing the children.

In men's industrial work, various grades of efficiency are recognized. There is the ambitious, productive man, filled with the pride of good workmanship; there is the slacker, the loafer and "soldier;" lowest of all, there is the parasitic agitator, whose only work is sabotage, and who is regarded as a criminal.

In woman's work—motherhood—these same grades may be distinguished. There is the productive mother; there is the slacker, the parasite letting others do her work; finally there is the vicious

and criminal element engaged in sabotage. This consists largely of oversexed and incontinent young spinsters and divorcees, and of undersexed, celibate spinsters of older age, all of whom, under the banner of individualism, are destroying the machinery of society.

Far from being admired as emancipated women whose careers should be emulated, these (and their male accomplices) should be regarded with the contempt they deserve, and which their brothers of similar records in industry actually receive—contempt of every honest worker, and of the public which, in the long run, is the chief sufferer from every attempt to foster revolt in place of evolution.

XI. EXCESSIVE REPRODUCTION IN INFERIOR FAMILIES

Children born in homes where squalor, poverty, disease, crime, and mental defect are the rule, usually either die young or live to be handicap to themselves, their parents, and the nation. A sentimental and unbiological attitude toward parenthood has in the past too often encouraged such a travesty on real parenthood: so that, for example, a feeble-minded girl in the almshouse would be encouraged to become the wife of some degenerate farmer in the neighborhood, in order that she might know the beauty of maternity and—above all—in order that the community might no longer be put to the expense of her support. Of course, when she came back to the almshouse, 10 years later, after being deserted by her husband, and brought with her four or five feeble-minded offspring to add to the burden of the county, the problem of motherhood was sometimes seen, by a few persons, in a different light.

In homes where foresight and prudence are lacking, where alcoholism is common, and where little restraint is put on natural inclinations, the birth-rate is likely to be high. One hundred dependent families of native white stock, reported by H. J. Halverson, showed an average of 6.5 children each. Feeble-minded persons who applied for relief to the Associated Charities of Madison, Wis., were found, according to O. E. Baker (Paul Popenoe, 1918) to have 6.2 children each. A. H. Estabrook discovered, in his study of the great Juke clan, a group of several thousand criminals, imbeciles, paupers, and ne'er-do-wells, that the women have on the average 4.3 children apiece—twice as many as do college professors' wives.

Without going into tedious detail on this subject (the facts of which have often been exaggerated) it will be admitted by most people that childbirth in families markedly characterized by

"the three D's"—defect, delinquency, and degeneracy—is rarely a blessing to any one concerned, and that if it can be prevented, the gain will be unmixed.

Considering the character of the parents, little can be expected from their voluntary co-operation. They are not capable of it, even if they wanted to give it. Society must interfere, for their benefit as well as its own. The methods of interference most widely favored are sterilization and segregation.

Advocates of sterilization argue that nothing more is necessary than to perform compulsorily (under suitable laws) appropriate operations on men and women of the classes under discussion. Such operations make it impossible for the persons to have children, although they do not otherwise interfere with the sexual life in any way. They are relatively inexpensive; they are done once for all; and society may then wash its hands of the case, confident that it will not in the future be troubled by the offspring of these misfits.

Of the objections that may be brought against this procedure, two are most often heard. (1) Sterilization does not safeguard *all* the interests of society, for while it does (in most cases, at least) remove the individual from the list of possible parents, it does not make it any less likely that he or she will be a sexual delinquent, spreading vice and disease on all sides. It is therefore not adapted to the delinquent type, unless accompanied by proper supervision.

(2) Such a course does not adequately discharge society's duty to the individual. The man under consideration is, it must be remembered, physically or mentally defective in one way or another, and quite incapable of holding his own in competition with the normal members of society, in the struggle for existence. This defect is, indeed, one of the reasons for his delinquency, in many cases. Simply to sterilize him and then to set him free, to stand or fall, is cruel. It is also unwise from the narrowest point of view, for it is nearly certain that he will make trouble for society in many other ways than by mere reproduction: he will become, or continue to be, a dependent or a delinquent. And

whatever is true of men in these respects is doubly true of women. Society therefore owes to itself, as well as to the individual concerned, to give further protection by life-long custodial care. This objection is valid with reference to some classes of defectives, but the experience of California, where some 5,000 operations have been performed to date, indicates that there are many defectives who can not only be trusted safely in charge of relatives after sterilization, and live useful lives in the community, but may even marry happily. Usually the individual and his relatives are much pleased to have had the operation performed.

Segregation with life-long custodial care, which is already in operation in most states for a minute percentage of the feeble-minded, should be extended to take in other misfits who can not hope to make their own way in the world successfully, and whose inadequacy is a source of harm both to themselves and to society.

There is a third measure, much more widely "agitated" than either sterilization or segregation, which requires consideration here. This is Birth Control, which I write with capital letters to distinguish it from the proper sense which the words would naturally have if used alone.

Birth Control, while pseudo-biological, has in fact become a quasi-religious cult, its god a modern Moloch whom only the continual sacrifice of little children can prevent from wreaking vengeance on his abject worshippers. Like other new cults, it is marked by zeal, fanaticism, intolerance, and enjoyment of mild martyrdom, together with lack of a sense of humor. That it is actually religious (i.e., based on belief in a different order of things than any found in this world) may be seen by considering it in France. Quality of population is as desirable in France as in any other nation; but beyond this, if there is any nation whose people might be pardoned for temporarily seeking quantity, it is France, where deaths often exceed births, where more than three millions of population were lost through the World War, where thousands of acres of good farm land are lying idle for lack of hands, and where several millions of unassimilable immigrants have had to be im-

ported in recent years to do the necessary work of the country. Yet in these circumstances the Birth Control missionaries are just as indiscriminately active in France as elsewhere, rending heaven with their outcry against "breeding like rabbits," in a country where two children already make a large family!

Like most other cults, Birth Control professes admirable purposes: indeed, it promises a near approach to, if not actual arrival at, the Millennial Dawn, for the success of the cult would, so its votaries say, exterminate war, wipe out poverty and misery, remedy the housing shortage, allay industrial unrest, reduce ignorance and crime, diminish alcoholism, emancipate woman, favor early marriage, prolong the span of human life, check the spread of venereal diseases, abolish child labor, eliminate illegitimacy, obviate abortion, and produce a new race of supermalthusians, superior in physique, mentality, wealth, culture, and ethics to anything now known.

The real meaning of Birth Control is birth prevention, or more exactly, the prevention of conception, which is to be brought about by the use of certain methods, on which the propagandists differ widely. All the benefits mentioned in the preceding paragraph, and others too numerous to mention, are to ensue from the general practice of "voluntary parenthood." If mothers bear children only if, when, and as wanted, the New Era will be ushered in. At a blast from the trumpet of a feminist Gabrielle, multitudes of happy parents with their child will begin to throng the streets of gold, while Capitalism and Militarism will be cast into outer darkness, where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth.

Now the fact is that some means of control of conception has been in use ever since the beginning of history; that artificial means of preventing conception are in almost universal use at the present day among civilized people; and that it is highly desirable, if not necessary, for parents to use intelligence in planning and producing their families. These facts are denied by few thinking and independent people. Birth control practice, in one form or another, is recognized by the general population as proper. Why, then, the furore?

The principal hindrance to an extension of rational birth control practice at the present time is nothing more nor less than the Birth Control propaganda. In a nation which has been notorious for bad propaganda for bad causes, nothing has surpassed in badness that of Birth Control, and the sooner the extreme and characteristic forms of this propaganda are repudiated and suppressed, the sooner will the proper spread and legalization of birth control practice be possible.

Scientifically, the main objections to the Birth Control propaganda are:

1. It is a purely emotional production, an appeal to sentiment, based on individual cases written up in the style which *Suffering Womanhood* popularized in describing its symptoms to the late lamented Lydia E. Pinkham.

2. It has no constructive program—not even a program of application. It simply proposes to let down the bars. Even its proponents admit that this will do some harm, but they claim that the harm will be more than counterbalanced by the resulting good. “The end justifies the means.” But why should there not be an intelligent plan of action that would at least minimize, if not wholly prevent, this harm? Since the Birth Control propagandists virtually admit that letting down the bars will increase sexual promiscuity, is it not incumbent on them to come forward with a constructive program, instead of their present wholly negative and destructive one? Unless, indeed, they take the position that an increase of promiscuity is a negligible matter.

3. The Birth Control propaganda has been pushed with a reckless disregard for biology, and for science in general; and largely by persons who have no acquaintance with science, and seemingly no desire to become acquainted with it. Many of the conspicuous professional agitators are either spinsters, or unhappily married women and divorcees, with no children or at most a child or two. Any psychologist knows why they are crusading for Birth Control. Not one of them has, to my knowledge, ever shown a sound conception of the population problem.

This problem presents innumerable aspects, but the present

discussion may be limited to four, which represent the respective interests of (a) the family, (b) the nation, (c) the race, and (d) the world. A large volume would be too small to expound any one of these fully. Here only a salient point or two can be mentioned.

(a) It is to the interest of the family to have a number of children proportioned to their quality, and also to such factors as the finances of the parents and the strength of the mother. Normal people do not bear children altruistically, to prevent race suicide; but selfishly, because they find greater pleasure in superior children than in anything else. The first great disservice which the Birth Control propagandists have done the family is to talk as if children were an almost intolerable burden, a curse to be avoided at almost any cost. A child or two may be endured in case of necessity, but every pregnancy is for the mother a step toward the grave, for the father a step toward bankruptcy, for both a step toward slavery. Such an attitude, probably quite unconscious, strikes the reader in every chapter of Margaret Sanger's books. Nothing could be more untrue. Childbearing is desirable in order that people may be happy individuals and good citizens.

(b) The interest of the nation is to be strong, vigorous, and progressive. To this end it requires an optimum population, proportionate to the food supply, to the organization of industry, and to many other economic factors. The Birth Control obsession is based on two fallacies: first, that "the fewer people, the better they will live," and secondly, that the optimum has already been passed in modern civilization. England, it is asserted, would be better off with 10 or 15 million less people than it actually has; and the implication always is, if conditions are so hideous now, think what they will be in two or three more generations!

If the case were as bad as represented, these excess millions might well colonize Canada, Australia, and South Africa. But the fact is that no nation can afford to have a sudden drop in its population, for the whole intricate structure of modern civilization is built on a given body of people, and any large withdrawal of people from under it is equivalent to withdrawing the foundations from a skyscraper. If population is to be reduced, it must be done very

gradually, by decreasing birth-rate, until a stationary population is attained. Less than a stationary population—*i.e.*, a declining population—is a source of danger in many ways, unless the decline is almost imperceptibly slow.

How is it with Great Britain in this respect? The population was some 37 millions in 1925. A. L. Bowley has calculated that, if the present rates of birth, death, and emigration continue, the population will increase to about 45 or 46 million about 1941, and thereafter will begin to diminish. Other statisticians have put the maximum at not more than 41 or 42 millions. It does not appear, then, that there is reason to go into hysterics over the future of Great Britain, for the decline is likely to be more rapid and to come sooner than the calculations indicate, because the death rate is not likely to rise rapidly, while the birth rate is likely to fall and emigration to increase.

France has already been mentioned. It offers an admirable illustration of what actually happens in a Birth Control state. There Africans, Asiatics, and illiterate Slavs are being imported by the hundred thousand to keep the machinery going, and thereby presumably forcing down still further the birth rate of the old native stock. The French people have proved abundantly that they have no sentimental repugnance to the idea or the methods of birth control. They have had a chance to experience the effects. They ought to be the best witnesses for it. But aside from a few fanatics, the French people certainly show little pleasure over the results of the policy.

New England is an equally good example. How is it with the United States as a whole?

The fact is that, in the old white stock of the northeastern United States, the birth rate has been falling for a century or more. Among *Mayflower* descendants whose ancestry was studied by S. J. Holmes and C. M. Doud, parents born between 1810 and 1830 had six children, while those born between 1870 and 1880 had one and a half.

The increase in population in the United States is now almost wholly due to immigrants, and to the old white population on the farms.

With restriction of immigration, the foreign source of increase will dry up steadily. With continuing trend of population toward the cities, the rural source of increase will dry up steadily.

Moreover, the increase has been due in part to a falling death rate. But this can not continue to fall indefinitely—all people must die some time. Therefore this source of increase will tend to disappear.

The plain conclusion is that overpopulation in the United States in any generation that can now be foreseen is a bogey as mythical as the Minotaur. On the contrary, the stage is all set for a steady decrease in the rate of growth of the nation. It is of no great importance to call for a lower birth rate in general now, (although some decline will not be harmful), but it is of tremendous importance to call for a higher birth rate among those people who can be assets rather than liabilities to the nation.

(c) The racial aspect of birth control is one of the most important and most ignored. If charity begins at home, Birth Control should begin abroad. Continued limitation of offspring in the white race simply invites the black, brown, and yellow races to finish the work already begun by Birth Control, and reduce the whites to a subject race preserved merely for the sake of its technical skill, as the Greeks were by the Romans.

A reasonable regard for self-preservation and racial values makes it appear that Birth Control missionaries might well be sent to the other races of the world, and required to convert those races before they were allowed to return and establish their peculiar kind of millennium at home.

(d) Looking at the world as a whole, the first question to be asked is whether the food supply will be sufficient a few centuries hence, to feed the population that will exist at that time. There is no need here to indulge in the popular pastime of belaboring the corpse of Thomas R. Malthus. It is sufficient to say, in the first place, that the population of the world will probably not continue to increase as rapidly as some statisticians have supposed, and in the second place that the development of the vegetable food resources of the world, by applying even such knowledge of plant-

breeding and horticulture as is now available, can increase those resources almost incredibly. Animal food ought to be abandoned anyway, for it is intolerably wasteful to feed a hog seven pounds of good food in the form of corn, in order to get back one pound of bad food in the form of bacon.

The world as a whole is not entitled to much sympathy as yet. The real points of anxiety should be that the best families, the best nations, and the best races are perpetuated. The great care should be that orderly and progressive evolution is not upset by the destruction of the superior types and the reproduction only of the inferior.

4. The Birth Control propaganda has been pushed with utter disregard for popular psychology. It has been provocative and vulgar where it should have been subtle and persuasive. If it had been handled differently, success might have been expected before this.

5. The Birth Control propaganda has been backed by no body of experimental or statistical evidence to substantiate its claims. Its arguments have been a tissue of untruths and misrepresentations so glaring as to deceive no one except those who expect rejuvenation from goat glands and the Electronic Reactions of Abrams. To this the propagandists reply that because of the American laws, it is impossible to get any evidence in America. They could, however, get it in Europe, if it is to be had. Instead of this, they content themselves with generalities and absurd claims which no disinterested person can take seriously. Holland is the favorite stage setting for these pearls, a familiar one of which is the assertion that "the average stature of the Dutch has increased over four inches in 50 years" as a result of the teachings of Birth Control.

In the light of these facts, what should be the attitude of those who are interested in the conservation of the family?

1. The present Birth Control cult should be repudiated by all responsible people.

2. Effective measures should be adopted to make knowledge concerning family limitation available to those who want it,

through the clinics for marriage and parenthood that I have described elsewhere in this book. Here such scanty scientific information as is available concerning contraception could be given, together with enlightenment as to the proper place of childbearing in family life, and warning against the harmful practices recommended by the professional Birth Controllers.

The immediate demand of the latter is for the repeal of the federal law which prohibits the circulation of contraceptive information by classing it with the circulation of obscene literature, pornographic pictures, and instruction in abortion. It has been said—with what truth I know not—that the inclusion of contraception in this law was inadvertent. Certainly it does not belong there. But this does not mean that the bars should be thrown down, and no restraint whatever put on the circulation of such information. That would merely invite a commercialization of the subject, with each manufacturer and dealer seeking to get as many customers as possible for his own products, regardless of the merit of these or the use to be made of them.

Repeal of the federal law would by no means remove all obstacles to the dissemination of information regarding contraceptives, for many states also have such laws. The federal law does not hinder a physician from giving information in any case where it is needed, and the laws of most states do not: where they do, I believe they are never enforced. It appears then, however desirable it may be to have the legal situation cleared up, that the existing laws do not interfere with a reasonable use of contraceptive information. They do, however, prevent Uplifters from advertising Birth Control clinics of their own.

The common proposal to put the control of contraceptive information in the hands of physicians is open to some objections. It might be argued that parenthood is not a disease, and hence not primarily the concern of physicians. Practically, moreover, it can be argued that the narrow education of physicians does not qualify them particularly to deal with the broader phases of family limitation.

On the other hand, the Birth Control advocates declare that free

knowledge of contraception is especially necessary for mothers who are sick or defective. In such cases a physician would be the natural one to consult.

Beyond this, the danger from the use of many contraceptives (inflammation, sterility, and the like) is great enough to make it desirable that they should be used by those who understand what they are doing. Until there are especially trained biologists available, therefore, it seems desirable that contraceptive knowledge should be sought from competent gynecologists. But as I have remarked above, these should be associated in a clinic with experts on heredity and mental hygiene, if family limitation is to be put on a scientifically sound and constructive basis.

The relation of physicians to contraception has one aspect that is not without its amusing features. Birth Control propagandists have insistently harped on the supposed fact that the medical profession possesses knowledge of tremendous import, which it would give to the public if it were permitted to do so by the repeal of the federal law. Many persons have therefore gone to physicians to get this mysterious information, and have been astonished to be told that the physician knew of nothing that answered to the description given by the propagandists.

The physician was telling the truth, although the client felt sure he was lying. There is no contraceptive method that possesses the perfection which the propagandists lead one to expect. But the propaganda has been so enthusiastic that many physicians began seriously to think that there must be some potent and mystical knowledge which they had overlooked and which they were really supposed to have. The result is that more than 7,000 of them have written to a New York Birth Control propagandist, earnestly desiring to get this knowledge which they are represented to conceal!

It goes without saying that the medical colleges must deal with problems of the conservation of the family in a broader and more fundamental way, if their graduates are in the future to play the part which they are expected to play, and ought to play, in the community. But even with this, the public would be much dis-

appointed if it found out how unsatisfactory is all the real knowledge in existence concerning contraceptives.

3. But as a prerequisite to any direct action for the wider spread of contraceptive information, the general campaign for eugenics and social hygiene must be linked up in such a way as to give the public a proper perspective. Contraception is not an evil in its place, but its place is not isolated. The second great disservice which the "sob sisters" of the Birth Control press bureaus have done to family conservation is to isolate contraception. It is not the free and universal knowledge of contraception that is objectionable. It is the free and universal knowledge of *nothing but* contraception, to which objection must be made vigorously. Contraception is only a means, though an important and necessary one, to intelligent family life under modern conditions. (Even Roman Catholics insist on this, although they demand that conception be prevented by continence, rather than by intercourse "with precautions.") It is one of the numerous necessary and important items in a plan for the conservation of the family and the regulation of population. Unfortunately, the devotees of the cult can see nothing except contraception. What little lip-service they give to the fact that childbearing among superior people is both a duty and a privilege, is wholly drowned out by the volume of their clamor as to the evils of childbearing among their putative clients. It is indeed only recently that the principal organs of Birth Control in the United States have, largely at the instance of Roswell H. Johnson, made even a perfunctory declaration in their creeds that they believe in adequate reproduction among superior people, as well as in the restraint of excessive reproduction among inferiors; and even this perfunctory declaration is flouted.

The Sixth International Neo-Malthusian and Birth Control Conference (New York, March, 1925) furnished a good picture of the situation that exists. At the final session Professor Johnson, seeing that nothing had been done in the course of the previous sessions to encourage the birth of superior children, introduced a resolution "that this conference believes that persons whose

progeny gives promise of being of decided value to the community should be encouraged to bear as large families, properly spaced, as they feel they feasibly can." The resolution was seconded by Francis B. Sumner and, after some opposition, was carried.

This action aroused the indignation of Margaret Sanger (Mrs. J. Noah H. Slee), president of the American Birth Control League, who devoted the leading editorial in the June, 1925, issue of the *Birth Control Review* to an attack on it. She declared that the resolution was presented at a sparsely attended meeting, and would probably have been defeated if introduced at a fully attended session. It was counter to all the real interests of the Birth Control movement, she believed; and after making a confused attack on the whole principle of the inheritance of ability, she laid down the law that "Birth Control in itself, urging not larger families but smaller families by the instrument of qualitative control, offers an instrument of liberation to overburdened humanity."

Professor Johnson's resolution is still on the minutes of the meeting, but it is clear that the present management of the American Birth Control League will not be enthusiastic in putting it into effect.

To harp so insistently and exclusively on the virtues of contraception is harmful in every way. It is—to use an inadequate simile—as if a campaign should be started to get people to eat more protein. No hint would ever be given that the body needed any other nourishment than protein. The merits of protein, and the dire plight of those deprived of it, would be exploited with all the force of passionate rhetoric: protein, Protein, and *more protein*, free and unlimited access to PROTEIN, would be declared to be the only salvation of society.

A biologist might well point out to such propagandists that while protein is a necessary part of the diet, most people eat too much protein already, and that protein-starvation is rare. He might urge that a general campaign of dietary reform would be more to the point: that people should be taught the place of proteins in the diet, their relation to the type of activity engaged in by different individuals, and so on. To all this the propagandists, if actuated

by the same spirit as those for Birth Control, would probably reply simply by giving the objector a hard look and shouting at the tops of their voices, "PROTEIN!"

Going back to the defective classes described at the beginning of this section, it will not be supposed that a knowledge of contraceptive methods, if they possessed it, would make much difference in their situation. Their recklessness, ignorance, alcoholism, lack of self-control, and disregard for the future, are sufficient guarantees that they will never keep down their own birth-rate effectively. If it must be restricted, for their own good or that of society, such restriction must be imposed by some force from without.

The stratum of society on which the Birth Control propagandists pin their hopes is that of the "poor but honest" in the tenements,—particularly the recent immigrants. To a marked extent this class, too, will prove unable to control its own birth-rate, even if provided with the necessary knowledge. While there is much good stock in this part of the population, it also contains more than its share of inferior stock: for the inefficient, improvident, and dull-witted in other classes of society tend to sink to this level, just as a stone tends to sink to the bottom of the pond. There are doubtless thousands of families characterized by poverty, ignorance, and maladjustment, where contraceptive methods should be known and applied. In a minority, perhaps even a majority, of cases, some good would result from intelligent and effective effort to provide these people with the knowledge in question.

Meanwhile, the widespread preaching of the Birth Control gospel in its "official" and one-sided form is heard and heeded mainly by those who do not need it. For every one who needs, gets, and uses the idea of birth repression there are a dozen who do not need it, but who get it and use it. There are thousands of families in which neither poverty, ignorance, ill-health, nor maladjustment exist, where parents are by tradition, birth, and education fully able to bear and rear superior offspring, and where the only obstacle to the birth of such offspring is the parents' feeling that a Ford is no longer compatible with their social pretensions, and that they must have a six-cylinder sedan next year instead of a baby. For

such people, a very different type of education is needed from that which is being broadcasted by the priestesses and prophetesses of Voluntary Parenthood. The cult has so far done infinitely more harm than good. Desirable as it is that the poverty of a few individual cases (doubtfully blamed on a few helpless babies) be relieved, it is more important that human welfare be safeguarded by the conservation of the family, and the birth and growth of healthy, happy, useful children, in homes that possess the necessary qualifications for producing such children. If the words "birth control" have any rational meaning, they must refer to a control that works both ways. Traffic on Fifth Avenue would make little advance if the system of police control invariably stopped moving vehicles but never started them. Similarly, birth control, if it must stop some births, must start others. And from a racial point of view, the latter function is much more important than the former.

To sum up: The practice of contraception is regarded by most biologists as an inevitable part of modern married life. The fact is scarcely open to discussion. The knowledge exists, it is widespread, and no sane person will suppose for a moment that the bulk of mankind can be prevented from making use of it¹ even if such prevention were desirable—which, on the whole, it is not. But the knowledge must be used rightly. One of the greatest obstacles to the right use and understanding of contraception is the Birth Control propaganda that has been poured forth in the United States during the last decade or two.

It is necessary, however, to go farther, and to point out that the general adoption of the "small family plan" is not from any point of view an unmixed blessing.

1. There is not yet known any wholly satisfactory means of contraception. Many of the methods most widely praised, especially by Birth Control propagandists, are inefficient. Robert L. Dickinson's investigation of this point simply proves what every

¹ Connecticut, however, has a law which makes it a misdemeanor to use a contraceptive. A record of the arrests and convictions under this statute would be instructive.

experienced married person already knew. Many of the methods are harmful, permanent sterility being a particularly unfortunate result in some cases. Most if not all methods are esthetically repugnant, in greater or less degree, to sensitive persons. Years of research will be required before contraception is in one-tenth as satisfactory a position, scientifically, as Birth Control propagandists would have it appear to be now.

2. The dissemination of knowledge concerning contraception tends to increase sexual promiscuity. I believe that no one who is acquainted with the underworld denies this. Even the Birth Control propagandists admit it, implicitly or explicitly. If the thought is objectionable to them, they usually take refuge in the stereotyped plea that the chastity of womankind can be of little value if it depends solely on the fear of pregnancy.

3. Any and all methods of family limitation, however advantageous to the individual, work a certain and probably a serious detriment to the race. This may be made clear if it is put in diagrammatic form. In days when there was little control of conception, weak, infertile, and feeble families produced, say, one child. Strong, fertile, long-lived parents produced, say, 10 children. If the weak families were as numerous as the strong ones (of course, they really were not), yet in the following generation strong children would outnumber weak children 10 to 1.

But with a universal family limitation, which held nearly all families down to two or three children, it is clear that under the same imaginary conditions the succeeding generation would see the strong children outnumber the weak not 10 to 1, but only two or three to one. In the course of a few more generations, the proportion of weak children in the community would increase notably, and the average vitality of the whole population would be pulled down correspondingly.

Whatever the exact proportions may be, this is in principle precisely what is now happening. The level of inborn vigor of the race is falling in each generation, because almost as many children are born in weak stocks as would have been born formerly, while fewer children are born in strong stocks than was formerly the case.

4. General practice of family limitation will lead to an increase in the proportion of males in the population, since boy babies predominate among the first-born, and to a less extent in the second or third born. The average equality of the two sexes is made up by the later-born children; but if these are not born at all, there will be an excess of boys. This may or may not be a desirable change.

5. Finally there is a great danger, during the transition period, in a rapid spread of birth control, for it results in a population made up of elderly people with a minimum of the young. Such a population is not progressive,—it tends rather to be reactionary. It tends to contain a disproportionate number of neurotic and arteriosclerotic introverts, suffering from balked dispositions and constantly seeking relief from these in some outbreak or other.

All these are not arguments for unregulated childbirth. They are simply facts.

PART III
MEANS OF SOCIAL CONTROL

INTRODUCTION

The question of the extent to which, and the manner in which, society should by direct or indirect compulsion limit the freedom of the individual is one that has been discussed since the beginning of civilization. There is yet no near approach to a consensus, among the most conscientious students of the subject. Certainly I shall not presume, in a few pages of a biological sketch, to settle the problems involved.

Nevertheless, some sort of working hypothesis on this subject is indispensable in any rational discussion of such a question as the conservation of the family. I can not therefore, even if I would, avoid entering on this hotly-contested field. Without attempting any far-reaching examination of an interminable and, as I think, insoluble problem, I shall call attention to a few simple principles that seem to me to furnish the best guidance available in this wilderness.

As a starting point it has been agreed, by all except out-and-out pessimists, that the survival of any given group or nation is desirable, at least to the members of the group, and that customs which tend to bring about the extinction of the group are to be repressed. The group must not only survive but, as it can not stand still and does not want to go backward, it must progress. To this end it must be made up of healthy, happy, useful, reproductive people. On a large scale, the interests of the individual and of the group coincide.

In detail, men and women are always wanting to do things that are not for the interests of the group. It is generally admitted that the state has the right and duty to repress any action that tends to weaken or destroy it. The problem is to determine which are the acts that affect only the individual, which those that affect others and are therefore proper subject for interference from others, if the effect on them is undesirable. It is about this point that the smoke of controversy is densest.

The whole trend of science during the last century has been toward demonstrating that actions which affect no one except the individual who does them are fewer than was thought—if indeed there be any such actions. No one lives to himself alone, and what appears to be the most personal and intimate performance has often been found, on analysis, to be far-reaching in its consequences. To take a stock illustration, nothing could apparently be more personal than failure to brush one's teeth; yet if the man who abjures oral hygiene thereby loses some of his molars, gets a focal infection which leads to chronic rheumatism, renders himself unfit for military service when his country is invaded, becomes unable to work and support his family, and sees his children die from lack of means to care for them, it is evident that his hostility to the tooth-brush was, in fact, of much more serious consequence to others than to himself.

Scientifically, then, a large part of John Stuart Mill's acute reasoning is as much out of date as the bow and arrow. The action that seems most innocent may involve the welfare of an entire nation. The tourist returning from Honolulu who brings in his baggage a few tropical fruits to please his children at home may thereby introduce to California the Mediterranean fruit fly, which will decimate the orchards of the state and levy a toll of a hundred million dollars a year on the American people. Freedom of action, in any general sense, does not exist.

How is it with freedom of opinion? This question has been even more hotly debated, if possible, than that of freedom of action. It seems plausible that, if a man must guard his actions, he may at least be permitted to think what he pleases, and there are many who hold any other point of view to be monstrous. On the other hand, there have been notable examples of the tendency of society to object to freedom of thought as well as freedom of action. Greece put Socrates to death, the Hebrews, with the approval of the Romans, crucified Jesus, the Papacy brought Galileo to his knees in short order. Few would now argue that any one of these actions was right; but such cases as the imprisonment of conscientious objectors and advocates of communism are nearer at

hand and there is yet no general agreement as to how such persons should be dealt with.

Here again, however, the progress of psychology is gradually clearing up the situation. It is well recognized that most beliefs do influence action. The man who, walking through a graveyard at midnight, sees a dim white object approaching him, will react differently according to whether he does or does not believe in ghosts. Even if a man kept his beliefs to himself, and never divulged them to anyone else, they would be certain to influence his own actions, and thereby be of importance to his fellow-men; while if, as is almost invariably the case, he does communicate his beliefs to others, the actions of others are in turn influenced. It might be said that beliefs likely to result in desirable actions are approvable, while beliefs likely to result in harmful actions must be looked upon with disfavor by society. But, as has already been pointed out, almost every action reaches much farther than its perpetrator suspects. Therefore there is no escape from the conclusion that every belief as well as every action of an individual is of importance to society as a whole, and a proper subject for scrutiny with a view to the protection of society.

Stated thus baldly, this sounds like the doctrine of the Inquisition; yet in fact it is everywhere acted upon in daily life. The day of individualism is past. If anything deserves to be damned by the application of the apparently deadly epithet, "mid-Victorian," individualism does. No man is now allowed to maintain an open cesspool in his back-yard. It is of no use for him to assert that it is artistic, that the luxuriant vegetation growing around the edges furnishes the kind of beauty needed in this prosaic world, that those are Philistines who can not appreciate the iridescent reflection of the surrounding tenements, on its still surface, or the marvelous algae which fringe its edges, and which seen through a microscope reveal a whole new world of unimagined sublimity. Anyone who would talk thus would be silenced quickly by his neighbors and by the board of health.

It is still the custom in some circles of the intelligentsia to talk in the same strain about books that are psychologically what the

open cesspool is physically; but the day when this sort of talk will be taken seriously, even among the literati, is passing rapidly.

Censorship, indeed, is in much the same position as birth control. It is universally admitted to be necessary. The only question is, how is it to be done? Some would prevent births by continence, others by abortion, some would censor "Art" by public opinion, others by fig leaves. But both parties, while attempting to annihilate each other, are actually in full accord on the original principles involved. As the developments of psychology have revealed with startling clearness the unsuspected extent to which character is influenced by surroundings, by "contagion," by emotional states which have long been forgotten, it has become more and more obvious that mental sanitation and hygiene are just as important and legitimate functions of the state as are physical sanitation and hygiene.

In all ages there have been offenders against the accepted code. There always will be. It is only a decadent civilization that gives them freedom of action. Any strong and progressive civilization must and will fight incessantly to protect itself. Any wise man will recognize that a continual fight is necessary in the nature of things. As public assent is gained in support of one principle, research will already have enunciated a new one, for the adoption of which a new fight must be started at once. It would be delightful if a population could be found that would at once recognize the validity of any newly-discovered truth, and act upon it; but there has never been such a population.

The questions really open are (1) how are standards of judgment to be established and (2) how are they to be enforced? In the past, standards of judgment have been fixed largely by tradition, prejudice, and often deliberate incitement of bigotry; they have been enforced with a sledge hammer, a bonfire, or a guillotine. In both cases the procedure is inadequate.

1. Since standards of judgment are based on the decision whether a given action is or is not favorable to the progress of the race, it is evident that they should be formed after scientific investigation, which will determine by experimental or statistical inquiry,

just what the effects of the action in question are likely to be.¹ It is not to be supposed that such a decision can always be made easily, nor that it can be made at all, in every case. Yet this ideal is being more nearly reached every year.

Within the memory of every adult now living, it was almost universally supposed that the establishment of a Red Light District offered the best means to minify the evils of prostitution and to control the spread of venereal diseases. As a result of some 20 years of painstaking investigation, it is now proved to the satisfaction of everyone who knows anything at all about it, that such a means is the worst, rather than the best, possible to gain the ends in view. It is not rash to predict that no reader of this book will live to see the establishment of segregated districts advocated by any intelligent body of public opinion in the United States. Here is a case where the old standards set by ignorance, tradition, and self-interest have been superseded by those set by scientific research. Innumerable others of the same sort will occur to every reader.

What of the cases in which there is not yet enough evidence for a decision? Clearly it is the duty of the state (a) to use every effort to get evidence, by subsidizing research; (b) to go slowly, meanwhile, in encouraging or allowing changes in existing customs. Human customs ordinarily represent a means of adjustment of mankind to its civilization; there was a reason for their coming into existence. As societies change, customs have to change: so that theoretically and broadly it may be said that no custom is ever exactly right, but that none is wholly wrong and purposeless. On the average, more trouble will probably ensue from giving up old customs before they have been definitely shown to be wrong,

¹ This proposition was stated by Francis Bacon (*de Augmentis* 7, 3) with his usual clearness. Moral philosophers, he said, ought to set themselves vigorously to work for the purpose of discovering what are the actual effects produced on human character by particular modes of education, by the indulgence of particular habits, by the study of particular books, by society, by emulation, by imitation. Then we might hope to find out what mode of training was most likely to preserve and restore moral health.

than by holding to them until they are so shown. But when once the proof is available, all the weight of the state should be thrown toward changing them, regardless of vested interests which usually try to maintain any *status quo*, no matter what it is.

The only people likely to dissent from this analysis of the situation are those who think that social problems can be settled definitely and correctly. Such an attitude, which is unfortunately widespread, is wholly erroneous. Human nature is so complicated and contradictory, civilization is such a patchwork and jumble, that to anyone who looks at it soberly, it is inconceivable that any ideal condition can ever be reached, in the adjustment of civilization to mankind. The best that can be hoped for—and even this will not often be attained,—is a more or less rough approximation, in which the gains will outweigh the losses. But to expect that, outside of the New Jerusalem, there will ever come a time when, for instance, all wealth will be distributed precisely in proportion to what people deserve, or the best men will be elected to all offices, or all laborers will take joy in their creative work, or all children will be properly trained by their parents, or all husbands and wives will love each other—to expect, in short, that a wholly satisfactory situation will ever be found, is to expect sheer impossibility. All that the most sanguine can demand is that affairs will go at least a little better, and that such changes as are made shall be in something like the right direction, if not on precisely the path that is later found to have been straightest.

In short, society is justified in controlling in any way necessary for its own preservation, the actions—and even the beliefs—of its members. Standards should be set by free and sympathetically-protected scientific research. The current standard should be the consensus of the most skilled students in the field, at any given time.

Such a procedure is in line with evolution, because it replaces the hit or miss methods of the past with intelligence. Hitherto, mankind has proceeded largely through experimenting at random (“trial and error”). Those who went wrong died or left no descendants; those who went right survived and perpetuated the species.

Such, in extremely broad outline, has been the process followed alike by man, bird, fish, earthworm, and ameba.

Such crude methods are no longer necessary, if mankind will use what little reason it has. It can study the consequences of actions; it can control actions; it can therefore direct its progress with some intelligence.

In the light of these facts, one can appraise the claims of those who cry that monogamy is out of date, and that free experiment in sexual relations must be encouraged, in order that an arrangement better suited to human nature may be discovered. While they consider themselves the last word in progressiveness, they are in fact returning to the Stone Age. There has been plenty of experimentation already; mankind has done little else in its entire history. Whole races, nations, and civilizations have perished because their experiments were made on a wrong hypothesis. The records of many of these experiments are available in history, and modern men and women can profit by them. They all point to one road—monogamy—as the road along which evolutionary progress is to be made. The others are known to be beset with danger. What is needed now is not fresh experiments, but the application of intelligence to make the best use of the road that is known to be open—to broaden it, clear it of obstacles, and keep traffic moving down it most expeditiously.

2. The means by which action may be made to conform to the accepted standards are innumerable, and have formed the subject of some detailed and highly interesting treatises in recent years. Here it will be sufficient to sketch only the broad outlines of the picture, since it is the purpose of the succeeding sections of this Part to fill in the details. To get conformity to the standards which investigation has shown to be most desirable, society should:

(a) Make conformity possible, by removing obstacles (economic, for example).

(b) Make conformity attractive, by education, economic conditions, public opinion, and the like.

(c) Make all alternatives unattractive or unattainable.

(d) Punish excessive or conspicuous failures to conform; and in

particular, stamp out all commercialized efforts to balk conformity or to exploit non-conformity for gain.

These are put in the order of their importance. Unfortunately, there is a common tendency to reverse the order.

To say that a community can not guide both the actions and the thoughts of its members is not at all in accord with facts. To the parrot phrase, "You can't change human nature," one might with equal truth retort that human nature never does anything except change. Every community is continually molding the thoughts and actions of its members, for good or ill, in every conceivable direction. Prussia made its peculiar official ideals seem attractive not only to its own citizens but to most of the other Germans, for half a century or more. In war time every state makes its aims seem good to its own citizens—widespread examples of this are part of recent history. Any organized effort can make social aims much more attractive than anti-social aims, because they are more nearly in accord with that mysterious and elusive thing,—human nature.

I. EDUCATION

Education for family life not only begins with the infant in the home, but this phase is more important than any other, for the emotional attitude toward sex and parenthood, which the child adopts before he is five years old, largely determines his attitude toward them in all of his later years.

The primary factor in education is therefore the example of the child's own parents.

Next to this comes their definite instruction of him. At the age of two or three, the child begins to ask questions bearing on sex. Normally, he would continue to ask them for the rest of his life. But if, as is usually the case, he is put off with evasions and lies, or is reprimanded for inquiring about such a subject, he finds that nothing is to be gained from that line of investigation. Then in place of dismissing the questions largely from his mind, as the result of having received satisfactory information about them, he broods over them, seeks information from worse sources, and acquires a set of complexes.

No parent can waive responsibility in this matter. The duty of educating the child belongs to the parent and to no one else.

Much discussion has been wasted on the question whether it is the duty of the father or the mother. Manifestly it is the duty of both. Whichever one is asked a question must answer it simply and truthfully. It happens that this is most likely to be the mother, merely because she is with the children during more hours of the day than is the father.

Many parents shirk their duty by telling the child that he is "too young to understand," and inwardly (though falsely) resolving that before the child reaches puberty he shall be given the necessary information.

If it is delayed until the child reaches adolescence, the duty is found by most parents to be difficult—so much so that in the great

majority of cases it is shirked forever. Meanwhile the child has, in 99 cases out of a hundred, already picked up a miscellaneous collection of misinformation, much of it of the most harmful character.

Clearly, the parent should so instruct his child in this particular, that nothing will ever have to be unlearned. Frank and accurate, though simple, answers should be given to the first questions. The parent who lies to his own child, by palming off such ancient and vicious fables as "the silver spade," "the stork," "the doctor's satchel;" or who takes refuge in the pious evasion that babies come from heaven, has betrayed his child's confidence.

If the child is told early enough, it will be no more embarrassing to tell him the truth, than to lie to him.

WHY PARENTS FAIL

When the matter, presented in this way, sounds so simple, why do an overwhelming majority of parents shirk their duty, and take refuge in evasions or lies? Some, of course, are not convinced of the desirability of sex education; others are merely lazy or indifferent, or not intelligent enough to think of the matter at all. Those who believe that their children ought to be educated properly, but do not educate them, are held back mainly by three reasons:

1. Their own mental attitude toward sex is so confused and unsound, if not perverted, that it can not be communicated to a child.
2. They do not begin early enough.
3. They have not a suitable vocabulary. Many parents, for instance, know no other names to describe reproduction and the reproductive organs, than the popular terms, of more or less ill-repute, that pass on from generation to generation among the ignorant. These terms have connotations and associations that are rightly regarded as objectionable. There is a scientific vocabulary which is free from objections. It should be used consistently from the first, to the exclusion of any other.

It is not necessary to tell the children much, but it is necessary to tell them early. It is not to be supposed that they will under-

stand everything they are told; but if it is evident to them that nothing is being concealed, they will attach little importance to the subject. The child's mind is not morbidly or pruriently concerned with sex—at least, not until after the parents make it so.

In this connection there is a school of pedagogy which would smother the facts with sentiment. If the child asks where its little sister came from, the mother is advised to defer the conversation until a propitious moment about twilight, when the lamps are dimmed, and when, to the accompaniment of soft music, she will take the child into her arms and explain, in a voice hushed yet vibrant with emotion, how little sister was cared for in a warm, soft nest under mother's heart; how mother hoped and prayed during the long, long months of waiting; how mother suffered in bringing her child into the world; how she loves her correspondingly; and so on.

Much of this is untrue, most of it is unwise. Little sister did not develop in a nest under mother's heart, but in mother's lower abdomen. When the child later discovers this fact for himself, he will wonder why his mother lied to him so unnecessarily, and what there is about the lower abdomen to make it so indecent that the womb must be moved out of it up to the position normally occupied by the stomach. Moreover, the sentimental emphasis in this sort of pedagogy is likely to be altogether too effective, and to play an important part in forming mother complexes, from which the child may suffer greatly in future years. In direct conversation, plain, simple facts are called for. The sentiment can be instilled better by illustration, in the parents' own attitude toward each other and toward their children, as expressed silently in every day life.

A new pregnancy in the family offers an excellent opportunity for the children to learn not only about the development of a new baby, but of the proper attitude toward a pregnant woman.

By the time the child starts to school he should have as much actual information as will be called out by his own questions—the extent of these of course varies greatly with different children—and, much more important, he should have acquired sound emotional attitudes toward everything connected with family life,

in so far as it has come under his observation. Parents who are either prudish or vulgar in their relations with each other can hardly expect their children to grow up without being either prudish or vulgar.

A reasonable amount of dressing, bathing, and romping together of the members of the family is an excellent way to develop a natural and wholesome outlook on the human body; but understanding of the physical differences should be included gradually with the broader differences between the sexes of temperament, dress, division of labor, and relations to the child himself.

On the other hand, parents must be extremely careful about letting children, even infants, see the more intimate phases of married life. Such revelations make an impression at a much earlier age than the parents realize; and the impression thus gained is premature.

Reticence concerning family matters, in the presence of outsiders, should be cultivated to include sexual matters along with others that are private affairs of the particular family.

Physical hygiene must be watched carefully but unostentatiously, particularly as regards care of the genitalia. Good habits should be formed, bad ones avoided or broken promptly. Ceaseless vigilance is required to protect the child from contamination by ill-educated playmates, or by older persons, especially domestic servants.

Even at this age, parents may begin to emphasize the ideas of heredity and parenthood, in connection with sex. These lines of thought are scientifically the soundest, and personally the most useful in giving children a right attitude toward reproduction.

EDUCATION DURING SCHOOL YEARS

During school years, this type of education should be continued in the home, and should be re-enforced by nature study, and by the teacher's attitude, in the school. The latter is often unfavorable at present, under the system that places most primary pupils in the hands of inexperienced girls whose own attitude toward family life is either not developed or is developed in wrong direc-

tions. It would be worth while trying the experiment of placing education in the hands of mature married women, whose children have grown up. Such women usually have leisure, which they are either unable to occupy, or else occupy in unprofitable ways. Many of them would welcome an opportunity to do some useful and remunerative work. Their influence on the children, as regards preparation for family life, could scarcely be worse than that of the callow normal school graduates who hold the ground at present. On the average, it would probably be much better. Anyone above the mental age of eight or nine years may be able to teach children the multiplication table, but how to produce good character in children is not to be learnt merely by passing the final examinations of a normal school course in child psychology. It is to be learnt by living, and by bringing up a family of children.

This point of view is opposed sometimes. Thus M. A. Bigelow writes: "The greatest medical teachers have not had the diseases they describe so clearly. The best elementary teachers and specialists on the care of children are not always mothers; on the contrary some of these are men. The fact is that these teachers have learned, not from personal experience, but from the great accumulation of scientific knowledge of medicine, hygiene, and education. There is an abundance of such knowledge relating to sex that may be clearly understood by bright women who have no bi-personal knowledge of sex. Therefore I believe that it is nonsense to insist that only women with complete sexual experiences can be efficient guides for other women."

Dr. Bigelow's idea is perhaps valid in a limited field of specialization, as anatomy or physiology, and it may be that he intended to apply it only in such a field. It seems to me inapplicable to more elementary teaching—and it is the latter that is of greatest importance. The teacher's own mental attitude toward her subject is of little concern in a discussion of, say, typhoid fever. Abundant observation shows, on the other hand, that it is of great concern in a discussion of sexual intercourse or of parenthood; and Dr. Bigelow himself makes this abundantly clear in other connections. The same restricted outlook, the same lack of compre-

hension and balance, that have been charged against monastic celibates, too often characterize the pedagogical celibate. Even for those who have taken no vows of life-long celibacy, "the outlook on existence is necessarily one-sided, and is especially curtailed in the direction of family life and the domestic circle, subjects on which right thinking and personal experience are of supreme importance in the national welfare." Whatever exceptions may be found, I believe that on the average the normal, experienced mother (or father) will be likely to have a more wholesome point of view than the inexperienced bachelor maid; and I agree with the W. C. D. Whethams that in this case "the personality of the teacher and the manner in which the subject is presented are of far greater importance than the actual substance of the information imparted."

It is generally recognized that the school can not possibly take the place of the parents in sex education. This is partly because the school does not get the children early enough; more largely because of sound psychological reasons why this teaching should begin in the home. But to a small extent, at least, it is also due to the inexperience of many teachers, the superficiality of their training, and the lack of intimate contact with the pupils. While these hindrances can not be removed altogether, it seems likely that a mature woman who had brought up her own children successfully, gaining their confidence and answering their questions, would be much more likely to be of assistance to her pupils, if they came to her with their difficulties, than would be the self-conscious young girl, just out of college, who is still trying to resolve her own difficulties and get answers to her own questions.

Nature study in the schools is of course to be looked upon merely as a supplement to education in the home, and not in any way as a substitute for it. The idea of introducing a child to the problem of reproduction by means of pollination in flowers seems to me highly questionable as an introduction, although it makes a good follow-up. As an introduction, it is open to the great danger that the child will not transfer the knowledge from botany to mankind.

In even the smallest home there is an opportunity for children

to keep a few pets,—mice, rats, guinea-pigs, and rabbits being particularly suitable. From the breeding of these the child can learn naturally enough the detail which embarrasses the parent most to explain—that is, the dependence of reproduction on coitus. Country children usually get this information from watching barnyard animals. The child's almost inevitable inquiry, whether human beings reproduce in the same way, should be answered simply and casually in the affirmative.

It is often objected that such a procedure tends to put reproduction on a purely physical plane, in the child's mind; whereas, in fact, this aspect needs less emphasis than any other, reproduction in mankind being predominantly mental and spiritual in its feeling-tones, in spite of the inescapable physical foundation.

All this is true enough, but largely immaterial, for the child must learn some time of the fact of coitus, and if he learns it in this early and natural way, it will be much less troublesome than to learn it later in life. The number of girls who do not get this fact until long after puberty, and who suffer for years from the fear that they may become pregnant merely through a kiss or an embrace, is astounding. It is the parents' part to see that the child's education does not stop short with mere knowledge of copulation, but that this is relegated to its proper place through observation in his own home of the psychical side of love. While the latter must be emphasized incessantly, the physical side is a fact which can not be ignored without disastrous results, and if the parents close their eyes to this, the children will not.

From start to finish, it ought not to be necessary to say that the child must be trained in self-mastery. Unfortunately, flabby wills are not so often made the subject of training as are flabby muscles, although they are almost equally capable of development, in normal girls and boys.

By the time they are 10 years old—therefore still in the primary grades—most boys and many girls have already learned something about coitus, prostitution, and venereal diseases. Usually what they have learned from older or vicious associates is incorrect and harmful; but they have learned something. If the parents have

not anticipated this by conveying at least a minimum of accurate information on the same subjects, so much the worse for all concerned. If, however, an attitude of complete confidence exists between parent and child (and normally there is nothing to break such an attitude until the time of adolescence, several years after the age mentioned) there should be no difficulty in giving both sexes an inkling of the facts. It is idle to suppose that they will remain ignorant. If they are not given any sound information, they are simply left at the mercy of worse-educated comrades, chance hearsay, and the commemorative inscriptions on the walls of public toilets. Most parents, with the attitude which is imputed—incorrectly—to the ostrich, argue that *their* children could not possibly know of "such evil things" at such a tender age; when in fact it has been proved again and again that the child knew as much as the parents.

The moral is that education must be continuous (although only occasional); that the child must always receive a little correct information in the home *before* he receives a lot of incorrect information outside. Both parents have still their part to play; the subject should be brought up in talks with either one, and on appropriate occasions, when it comes up naturally, it should be discussed by parents and child together. In such talks it is as important for parents to avoid an attitude of superstitious timidity, as one of flippant cynicism.

THE PRE-ADOLESCENT PERIOD

Before puberty, it is essential that boys be prepared to understand in part the normal development that they will undergo. If they do not, much harm may be done through worry or, in the case of extremely religious boys (and religious feeling is frequently one of the marked characteristics of this age), through a sense of guilt or sin.

In addition to recognizing that change of voice, growth of additional hair, and other physical manifestations are due to invisible internal secretions (from the testicles), the boy should be led to

expect, and to regard as perfectly natural, three manifestations that may confuse him if he is not instructed:

1. He should learn that seminal emissions are a healthful, not a harmful, experience, and that they are not a cause for embarrassment or shame, much less for fear.

2. He should learn to expect erotic dreams from time to time, and to take them as a matter of course. These sometimes cause remorse and mental anguish to religious-minded boys who have insensibly absorbed the common idea that sex is indecent and sinful.

3. He should learn that erections are likewise merely an evidence of his development, and of the preparation of his body for the part he is destined to play when he is mature, as a father. There should be no guilty feeling about them, nor, of course, any spirit of facetiousness. They will occur mainly when he awakes in the morning; when he is dancing or otherwise in contact with girls; and when he is engaged in such exercise as riding a horse or bicycle.

It is inevitable that novel and striking personal experiences like the three just mentioned should make a strong impression on the boy's mind. It is therefore necessary, for the sake of wholesome mental development, that this impression be turned to good account by the parent, in making the boy feel his preparation for adult life. There is no reason why he should not view such phenomena with lively interest, but he should be encouraged to have an objective attitude, and not to regard them as important save as indications of growth.

Girls should be instructed fully regarding menstruation, learning that it is merely a discharge of superfluous blood which had been prepared for the nourishment of an egg-cell, and which was not needed because the egg-cell was not fertilized and therefore could not develop. Full instructions should be given for the hygiene of this period, but it should be regarded as a normal condition, not as a sickness or a curse. Boys should also have some correct ideas about menstruation, to discount the vulgar and superstitious ones with which they will come in contact, and to form the basis for future tact and understanding in their attitude toward menstruating women. Both boys and girls will have gained correct ideas

of the anatomy of the sexes by observation in the home, supplemented by answers to inquiries concerning facts that are not self-evident.

IN HIGH SCHOOL

The same type of education in the home should continue throughout the high school period. It is not at all a question of whether or not one thinks that a child of this age ought to know of such things as prostitution and venereal diseases. The fact is that he does know of them—that, unless immured, he can not be prevented from knowing of them; and it is of the greatest consequence that his knowledge be accurate, sensible, and in proper perspective, rather than fragmentary, perverted, and sensational.

Mothercraft can be taught in high schools and preparatory schools. It is being taught in a few, with excellent results. While it can thus reach no more than three or four girls in ten (since the others leave school at the end of the eighth grade, or sooner) these are in some ways the pick of the whole population, and efforts to educate them are therefore more worth while than would be efforts with any other fraction. Girls at this period may well have the care of a real baby, and there are thousands of healthy babies in unfit homes who would benefit greatly from daily mothering by a class of eager high school students. But some schools which advertise instruction in home-making as a specialty, teach girls only by letting them dress and undress a large doll. Such methods argue a complete atrophy of the sense of humor.

Since only two or three in a hundred go beyond high school, this is the last period at which the public educational system has any opportunity to exert a wide influence, and it is especially desirable that preparation for family life be largely completed before the end of this period. Many high schools now have lecture courses of one kind or another. Some of these are conspicuously successful, others just as conspicuous failures, depending at present almost wholly on the personality of the teacher in charge.

I remember when lectures on "sex," by a local physician, were introduced at the high school in my own city, not so many years

ago. The boys were notified that they were to meet in the assembly hall at a given hour. Most of them entered it in apprehension, while the girls walked by hastily and silently, as a child does before a house placarded for smallpox. Before the period was half over, the rout began, as stragglers with white faces emerged hurriedly from the hall and made for the open air. Two or three who did not start quickly enough fainted on the spot and had to be carried out by the survivors seated near them. One youth, who happened to be sitting in a window sill, fell backward and broke a pane of glass, which cut him around the head; he was carried out bleeding, while little groups of girls watched furtively around the corners and doubtless supposed that all this was a normal part of instruction in sex.

All this perhaps sounds ludicrous, but it was a tragedy; and I am telling it merely because it illustrates a kind of sex education that is still too frequent. Parents who let their children grow up in ignorance or worse, and then depend on a few 40-minute lectures in high school, given by a local physician, to undo the harm of 10 years and furnish guidance for a lifetime, are more than stupid. Yet in one form or another, this is the course adopted by many parents, and one that has even been advocated by a few educators. "Keep the child 'innocent' until he reaches adolescence, then let the family physician or clergyman have a confidential talk with him and give him the instruction he needs to avoid the snares and pitfalls of life."

THE DOCTOR'S PART

I can imagine few classes of men worse equipped to fulfill this function than the clergymen, unless it be the doctors. As the latter have so often been made responsible, by cowardly or ignorant parents, for a duty that does not belong to them, it is worth while to inquire for a moment whether they are really qualified for such a tremendous responsibility. I believe it will be clear that, merely as doctors, they are not well equipped, either mentally or morally, to take the lead in social hygiene.

Mentally, the profession is made up of men of rather mediocre

intelligence,—a fact strikingly brought out by the army mental tests, and published by Robert M. Yerkes. Intellectually the medical officers were at the bottom of the list, inferior to all others in the army. Moreover, the education imposed on this native equipment does not fit them for the task in hand. Few of them have a really good grounding in biology, in a broad sense, much less any special knowledge, accompanied by a suitable point of view, on social hygiene. What has the profession as a whole done to cut down the spread of venereal diseases, stop prostitution, or eliminate abortions? In many cases, the greatest obstacle to progress has been the stubborn and sometimes self-interested opposition of the rank and file of the medical profession. In social hygiene, most of its members are far behind the times. I do not necessarily argue that they are inferior to the average of the population—only that they are not much, if any, above it.

Morally the situation is the same. Students in medical colleges are not particularly noted for social outlook and high personal standards, especially as concerns sex—not to mention the use of tobacco, alcohol, narcotic drugs, and other unbiological forms of activity. Professionally, they are as a class anti-social; they are primarily individualistic in their outlook, and their accepted code of ethics, which justifies flagrant lies told to patients in order to shield the reputations of incompetent fellow-practitioners, is immoral, in any true sense of the word. The public knows (and faddists, charlatans, and fighters for “medical freedom” make the most of the fact) that the ranks of the quacks, of the narcotic vendors, of the abortionists, and of the bootleggers contain many a graduated and duly licensed M.D.; and that it is sometimes difficult to get one physician to tell the truth about another, under oath, even in matters of the most serious character.

All this is not to disparage the leaders, to deny that there are many physicians well qualified for their work, or to lack hope for the future improvement of the profession. But the idea that the profession as such is a leader in social and educational matters is largely a survival of the savage’s veneration for the priestcraft and the medicine men. An amusing sidelight on this point is the

suggestion lately made, that certain books on sex education should be sold only on a physician's prescription—as if they were cocaine or Volsteadized whisky! The average physician has almost everything to learn, about the conservation of the family; but the necessity of making a living and keeping up with the progress of a vast and active specialty, leaves him little time to go back to the groundwork of evolution. Hence to depend on doctors, merely because they are doctors, to teach social hygiene, is merely to invite what actually happens in such a case—that a revolting mass of information about venereal diseases, prostitution, and sexual perversions is thrown at the heads of young people, and no effective attempt made to inculcate a broad, sound, constructive point of view in a matter that above all others requires such a point of view. The congressman who in a recent speech declared his interest in “maternity and other diseases of women” probably got his start in a lecture by the school physician. Putting sex education in the hands of the medical profession inevitably links it with the abnormal and pathological, in the minds of the young. For every reason, physicians should have as little as possible to do with the subject.

TEACHING FOR FAMILY LIFE

More is to be expected from teachers of biology, especially if they are parents themselves, and not merely young women waiting impatiently for an opportunity to become parents. A specialist might well start with a broad foundation of biology from an evolutionary point of view, particularly emphasizing genetics; on this a superstructure of physiology, psychology, sociology, and other studies could be set. But the training of adolescents for family life can not be left to any one specialist or any one course, and the attempt to make this a separate subject is a fundamental mistake. Every phase of education should be directed toward preparing the pupil for life; and as family life is the ultimate development, it should prepare above everything else for family life.

It would be difficult to lay out a curriculum less adapted to this purpose than most of those now to be found in the United States.

Surprisingly little improvement has been made in the three-quarters of a century, marked by so much progress in other fields of science, since Herbert Spencer discussed this subject in his essays on Education. A girl is not allowed to get past the eighth grade without knowing how to extract cube roots, although it is as certain as anything can be that not one in a thousand will use this knowledge at any time during the rest of her life; but a girl may graduate from elementary school, high school, and college, and take a doctor's degree at a university, without ever learning why breast-feeding is better for infants than bottle-feeding, or without ever being shown that the production of two infants, in a marriage, is not enough to replace the father and mother and keep the race from declining in numbers.

Why has it so far proved impossible to get the educational system to prepare children for life? The answer is doubtless to be sought in the inherent resistance to change, that all complex institutions possess, and the educational system above some others. The latter is largely an outgrowth of monasticism and of the Renaissance cult of classicism, and has not yet wholly outgrown its medieval clothes.

In earlier days, all the available knowledge concerning family life was acquired by the young (especially by girls) in their own homes. The only purpose of a school was to supply knowledge that could not be had in their own homes; particularly knowledge of the extinct classical civilizations. Since the beginning of the industrial revolution (usually dated about 1760), the home has gradually lost the ability to train its young for family life. The educational system should have noticed this fact, and altered its own methods to make up for the change. It has done so, however, only to a very small extent.

The whole modern curriculum appears to be shaped more or less unconsciously toward teaching people to teach. It is time to turn around and teach them to live. If they are going to teach afterward, they will teach none the worse for knowing how to live. The whole curriculum must be shaped much more consciously and intelligently toward the conservation of the family, and not be

looked on as an end in itself or as a training ground for those who seek the State Certificate.

This situation is illuminated by the results of an inquiry which M. V. O'Shea addressed to 5,000 women college graduates. He asked whether they were well enough satisfied with the courses they took to want to take them over again, if they were to start at the beginning once more; and if they would want their daughters to take the same courses. "The teachers, taken as a whole, are quite well satisfied with the education they received at high school and college," Dr. O'Shea reports. "The home makers, mothers, and social workers are, with very few exceptions, discontented with their education. Only four of the home makers and mothers would select the same course of study that they originally pursued, if they had an opportunity to go over their high school and college course again, because they failed to receive much help in solving the particular problems with which they have had to deal every day since they became home makers and mothers. The severest condemnation of the educational program was made by those who signed themselves *mothers*. Very few of them had an opportunity to study subjects in either high school or college that pertained to the nature or training of children, and now they have to care for children and train them. They do not want their daughters to go through the same regime that they were compelled to pursue. They do not wish to have their daughters pursue studies that relate only to the care and training of children or to home making, but they would like to have them devote some time to these matters while they are in high school and college.

"It is worthy of special mention that graduates of colleges for women complain more generally of the lack of opportunities to pursue courses related to home making and motherhood than do graduates of coeducational universities."

It is generally recognized in the theory of education that each subject should contribute to all other subjects: that the student of history or biology should learn English and logic from them as well, and so on. This sound doctrine must be applied effectively for the benefit of the home. Some subjects of course lend them-

selves more to this purpose than do others, though an enthusiast has declared that even grammar may be made the basis for sex education, since it has to do with gender and number. Biology and nature study, physiology and hygiene, physical training, domestic science and art, medicine, genetics and eugenics, psychology, sociology, ethics, religion, and above all, literature—whether English or foreign—are particularly capable of being made the vehicles of direct or indirect instruction.

But a different attitude will be required from that now often found. There is no need to try to prepare for family life by an anemic course entitled "Sociology 4, Origin and Development of the Family as an Institution (2 units)," taught in the same spirit which, teaching literature, only succeeds in disgusting the student with literature so that he never reads another good book during the rest of his life.

For some reason, many persons have come to think of education for family life as being "sex education," and further to think of it as a distinct, narrow, and special field of education. No greater mistake could be made than to attempt to prepare for family life in any such spirit. Unless the family is regarded as the central fact in human life, and all education is directed toward that fact, it will not reach the fullest success. Above all it must be insisted, in season and out of season, that merely to put certain *knowledge* into the hands of the students is not the object of education for family life. Such a conception is wholly inadequate and mischievously misleading. The object of such an education is the formation of character with a view to the guidance of action throughout life. Knowledge is necessary for this purpose, but mere knowledge alone may be worse than nothing at all.

THE TRAINING OF GIRLS

As sex plays a somewhat larger part in the life of woman than of man, it is logical that, if there is to be any difference in emphasis, women should have more thorough preparation for family life than do men. At present it can scarcely be said that this is the case. As long as the official spokesmen of women are so often abnormal

females whose avocation is to sympathize with themselves, it will be difficult to get the education of young women turned in the most desirable directions. No woman should be permitted to hold a responsible position of leadership in the educational world, such as president or dean of a college; or in a federal or state bureau devoted to the welfare of children and the family; unless she has successfully brought up children of her own.

The smug satisfaction of the eastern women's separate colleges with their own obsolete point of view is particularly a stumbling block, because so many young girls look to this group for leadership and inspiration. Bryn Mawr offers girls four courses in Sanskrit, but none in mothercraft. Wellesley offers six in geology, but none in mothercraft. Mount Holyoke offers eight in astronomy, but none in mothercraft. Smith offers 17 in mathematics, but none in mothercraft. Vassar¹ offers 18 in Greek, with three extra in Greek Archaeology, but none in mothercraft.

Defenders of the old order sometimes deny the necessity of differentiating the education of the sexes. The general culture is the same for both, they declare: both are to live in the same world. So far as a triviality like cookery goes, it is merely the application of some elementary principles of physics, chemistry, and bacteriology. If a girl gets these principles, she can apply them easily enough when the time comes.

Such a plea does not meet the facts squarely. It is true that higher education for the two sexes need not be very much differentiated; but it needs to be more differentiated than it now is. It will hardly be denied that what the women's colleges have really attempted to do is to assimilate man's culture as a whole. There is no objection to this as far as it goes (though some might think that man's culture represents a low enough ideal). But it stops short. Modern research continually emphasizes the need of differentiation of the environment of the two sexes to foster specialization of the particular functions connected with marriage and parenthood. There is need for serious consideration of the desir-

¹ I am informed that Vassar is now entering the field of education for family life in a more effective way.

ability of greater specialization in such matters as (a) sports, (b) teachers (including more men to teach the boys), (c) content of special courses, and (d) emphasis in some general courses. The last word has by no means been said on this subject, but emphatic protest must be made against the assumption that there is nothing at all to say.

Certainly the women who have completed the type of curriculum represented by the women's colleges, and have founded families, are far from satisfied with what was given them. And certainly the principle mentioned in the paragraph before the last is not accepted in any other kind of life work. If the engineering student who applied for a job on an irrigation project confessed that he had never run a level, but boasted that he had made a careful study of the theory of trigonometry, he would be laughed out of camp. Yet the notion that girls should study only abstract principles in college, and then find out how to apply them in practice, after they marry, is on the same footing.

Just as the engineering student spends his Saturday mornings running levels about the campus, or measuring the altitude of the chapel tower, in preparation for his future career, so the woman should have abundant laboratory work in such elementary feats as bathing an infant or attending him through minor ailments. Anyone who has tried for the first time to bathe a new-born babe knows that "maternal instinct" is far from sufficient to ensure a workmanlike job. At present many girls do not get such experience in their own homes prior to marriage; consequently they grow up ignorant and fearful, with a natural reluctance to undertake duties with which they are unfamiliar, and on the proper discharge of which a human life may depend. The graduate of a woman's college is more likely to know the respective merits of the Italian painters of the fifteenth century, than to know what to do when her baby has convulsions.

EDUCATION FOR FATHERHOOD

Potential fathers as well as potential mothers need education. The surprising thing is not that the family functions so badly in

modern civilized society, but that it functions even as well as it does, considering the obstacles that it has to encounter.

T. W. Galloway has pointed out that the family is much more successful than the grocery store—to cite a single other institution by way of illustration. The percentage of families which survives is six times as great as the percentage of groceries which avoid bankruptcy. The men who found families are presumably of about the same average order of intelligence as the men who establish grocery stores. But in the latter case the grocer has at his disposal all the agents of a highly organized wholesale business, interested in putting their knowledge at his disposal and seeing him succeed; he has on his table numerous trade papers, as well as high grade periodicals dealing more broadly with every phase of the theory and practice of retailing; he has access to numerous expensive and well-organized business colleges and high schools, and university departments (including extension and night courses) which teach business administration.

The father, on the other hand, will look in vain for any school to teach him the most elementary duties of fatherhood. He will scan in vain the polychromatic displays of newsstands for a magazine devoted to the problems of fatherhood. He will receive no visits from traveling men, anxious to aid him in making his work a success. He will, on the contrary, meet at every turn handicaps, detailed in the pages of this book and only too well known by experience to most fathers, and will encounter on every side an attitude of society which is seemingly intended to make it as hard as possible for him to succeed as a father.

The Commonwealth professes an interest in seeing that every boy and girl is developed into a good citizen. Should it not take a greater and more active interest in seeing that they become good parents, also? Is it not time that the production of a family be looked on as at least as important to the nation as the distribution of groceries, and that the father be provided with at least as much help as is available to "Your Neighborhood Grocer?"

The object of sex education in the past has too often seemed to be the production of chaste celibates. These are all right in their

place, but intelligent fathers and mothers are better, and the object of all education should be to produce young people who will be, among other things, intelligent fathers and mothers.

THOSE WHO ARE MISSED

The critical reader who agrees with this ideal will probably point out two serious practical difficulties, of which I have not hitherto taken much account in this discussion. In the first place, he will say, it is all very well to demand that parents teach their children, but most parents simply can not or will not do so: what is to be done about this? In the second place, four-fifths of the young people in the United States never get any farther than the eighth grade, at most. They leave grammar school to go to work. How are these to receive the necessary education?

The previous discussion dealt primarily with what I conceive to be some of the fundamental principles of education as related to the conservation of the family. The two grave difficulties just mentioned, in the application of these principles, must now be considered.

1. It will be admitted frankly by all interested in the subject, that, (a) many parents now can not or will not teach their children, but that, on the other hand, (b) there is now no agency to take their place. It is not now feasible,—and it never will be,—to make schools take the place of parents in this respect. Therefore, if parents will not do their duty, the first thing to do is to educate the parents,—more particularly, those who are soon to be parents. It is of course not to be supposed that any changes necessary in education for family life will be made at once and completely. As far as that goes, they will never be made completely. There will always be some parents too ignorant, irresponsible, mentally diseased, or vicious, to do their duty by their children. Nothing more can be expected than a determined attack all along the line, to see to it that a smaller part of the body of parents in each generation falls into any one of these classes.

Much can be done, and in some cases is being done, with existing parents by men's and women's clubs, parent-teacher associations,

church or fraternal societies, extension departments of colleges, night schools, and community organizations definitely formed for this purpose. The biggest single undertaking is that of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, representing 900,000 members. But the task is so great, and the inertia to be overcome is so tremendous, that all the energy available is needed.

2. Since the elementary schools can not deal adequately with family education, yet 80 percent of the population never gets any farther than these schools, what is to be done for this 80 percent, most of whom will also not receive adequate training from their parents? That is the main practical question involved in this whole section, and one too easily slighted in theorizing.

The only solution lies in thorough and intelligent community organization. If leaders are convinced that the job must be done, it can be done. "Every agency and individual that has to do with young life in any intimate way must be brought (a) to recognize responsibility, (b) to prepare itself as sanely as possible to contribute its part in inspiring boys and girls with sex ideals and attitudes that are true, appealing, and workable, and (c) to cooperate wisely with other instrumentalities in keeping its efforts well within pedagogically safe bounds." Prominent among these potentially valuable agencies are: clergymen and churches, church schools, public and private schools, physicians and medical organizations, Christian Associations, all types of boys' and girls' organizations, lodges and clubs of men and women, physical and play directors, and other social workers, Big Brothers and Big Sisters, employers in business and industry, guilds, trade organizations, and unions and associations of every kind. If the people in these various groups really want their boys and girls to grow up to be successful mates and parents, a new social conscience and an enlightened public opinion and wholesome atmosphere about parenthood can be created in a few years in any community.

Of course this does not mean that the zealous missionary will pounce on every child seen unattended in the street and inquire, "Little boy, do you know where babies come from?" It means largely an indirect campaign, which by taking account of the

fundamentals underlying wise mating, will create a community in which children will unconsciously absorb the right ideals. A vigorous public opinion to deal with the daily press, magazines, motion pictures, drama, commercial amusements, elementary education, and broken homes, and all the things that go to make up the indirect but powerful pressure that is exerted to mould the child mind, will do the work.

Space is lacking here to describe any of the numerous excellent attempts now under way to solve these problems. They will be found in current social and mental hygiene and educational literature. Much is already being done, but it is perhaps only one percent of what needs to be done, and what will have to be done before education will fulfil its function of preparing young people for life, in such a way as has been outlined by Herbert Spencer and many other thinkers before and since.

II. PUBLIC OPINION

Most of the things that men and women think, say, and do are, in part at least, the result of the complex action of powerful forces that may be grouped together under the title of public opinion. Without analyzing this, I shall in this section try to do no more than to classify loosely a number of ideas that seem to have immediate, practical importance, and to depend largely on public opinion, under five heads, as they relate to (1) children, (2) young people, (3) matrimony, (4) childbearing, and (5) some of the evils mentioned in Part II, that interfere with the normal course of family life.

CHILDREN

1. In the previous section emphasis was laid on the education of children, and particularly that important part of education which comes from imitation of parents. Here it is worth while to emphasize two points.

(a) Sex differentiation is biologically of fundamental importance, and the conservation and development of the great biological differences between male and female should begin in earliest infancy. Girls should be brought up to be girls, and eventually women and mothers; boys to be boys, men, and fathers.

It is necessary to insist on this because the extreme feminist attitude, with its complex of sex-inferiority and its desire to acquire the supposedly more honorific qualities of the opposite sex, is driving in the opposite direction. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, for instance, urges that little girls should be forbidden to play with dolls, lest they thereby become feminine. Many followers of this perverted counsel have probably had the experience of Charlotte V. Gulick who found, though her girl was given no dolls and supposed not even to know what a doll was, that the child took an old rag and endowed it with the imaginary attributes of infancy—the mother instinct was not so easily to be balked.

Part of the maladjustment in modern marriage is due to the lack of normal sexual development, mentally more than physically, in boys and girls. The latter are subjected to feminist theories, while the former are brought up by their mothers and by women teachers, and get little contact with men. It is high time to change the emphasis, both in the home and in the school, and deliberately endeavor to bring out in each sex the high values and precious gifts which it alone has. In the country, boys beyond the creeping age can spend much of the time out of doors with their fathers, and as they grow older they remain more and more in masculine companionship during the day. This is of especial importance at the ages 8 to 12, when a boy profits most by his father's influence. One of the most serious drawbacks of city life results from the segregation of fathers by business, which makes it impossible for their boys to be with them, and throws the latter almost wholly on the hands of their mothers and female relatives, or into the society of other children.

The lack of differentiation in education, especially in the later years, and the endeavor of many girls to assimilate the ways of boys as far as possible, has an indirect evil influence on family life, by concealing from boys the real differences in the mental life of the two sexes. Having been encouraged to look on girls as differing little from themselves, they carry this attitude over into marriage, and by sheer ignorance make many mistakes in their attitudes toward their wives. It is not necessary to make a mystery of the female sex, as was sometimes done during the middle ages; but a franker recognition of some of the deep differences, mentally and emotionally, between the sexes would encourage young men to study this subject more carefully, and thereby make a greater success of their married life.

As to models for boys, Sir Galahad is not the best hero. In a minor way, plays like *L'Aiglon*, *The Blue Bird*, *Peter Pan*, and several of Shakespeare's, in which girls habitually play the rôle of boys, have an undesirable influence. Even worse is female impersonation on the vaudeville stage by physically defective males.

Sex is a quantitative character, of course; all grades of it can be found. The two sexes shade off into each other—thus some women are more mannish than some men, and vice versa.

Apparently this is taken by one sect of feminists to justify education that will make all women mannish. But the only sound inference to be drawn from the quantitative nature of sex is that education should be directed toward bringing out the best and most characteristic features of each sex, rather than reducing them both to a common level of primitive, unspecialized animality. The proof of this is to be found by an examination of both types. It will be seen that individuals who are lacking in normal sexual development are, relatively, less efficient, less happy, and less useful members of society. They tend to suffer from mental disturbances and also, it appears, from physical disturbances. They seem to be more liable to certain diseases than are their more normally developed brothers or sisters.

To a large extent, it is true, an individual's degree of sexuality is an inborn trait, fixed forever at the moment of conception. But to a large extent, also, it is capable of modification by education and environment. Hence the importance of ordering a child's life in such a way as to bring out the best qualities of his or her own sex.

Apology is sometimes made for the low marriage rate of graduates of women's separate colleges, by the plea that only girls who are somewhat lacking in marriageability are sent there. If parents know a daughter will marry, it is declared, they do not send her to such an institution. If they think she may not, they enter her there in order to prepare her for a career.

While this statement has a small element of truth, its implications are bad. Girls who are, through birth or faulty upbringing, lacking in attractiveness to men or uninterested in marriage and motherhood, are in many cases the very ones who should have the benefit of the opposite course of treatment. They should rather be sent to a small coeducational college where they would rub elbows daily with boys, and have an opportunity to develop their emotional natures along normal lines.

If a boy is a "sissy," his parents do not send him to an institution where the other boys are of this type—they send him to a military academy or some other school where they think the frills will be knocked off and the masculinity appear. Conversely, unromantic girls should be given every encouragement to develop normally, and not be condemned to lifelong celibacy by being sent to institutions patterned on the model of convents.

(b) Avoidance of precocity in development of the mental characteristics of sex sometimes demands attention. The habit some adults have, of trying to force children into their own erotic attitudes is thoroughly vicious. Infants not yet out of the nursery are teased about their "sweethearts." Few amusements delight the average group of women more than to get a little boy and little girl in a room together and try to force them to caress each other. Somewhat later, when the boy and girl begin normally to take a keen interest in the opposite sex, they are plagued and tormented endlessly by all their relatives. The sexual development of children will usually take excellent care of itself if it is left alone; there is plenty of stimulus for it in every-day life, without the addition of an artificial and vicious stimulus based on the desire of older persons to get a vicarious satisfaction of their own over-stimulated sexual interests at the expense of the young and unsophisticated.

YOUNG PEOPLE

2. Something has been said in the preceding section about the formal education of young people for family life, but it is worth while to consider more fully the education of the emotions—the most important and yet most neglected field in education.

Why is "vice" so often more seductive than "virtue?" Largely because, in the sense the words are popularly (though vaguely) used, vice is an active thing: it is *doing something*. It therefore satisfies, to some extent, the inherent craving of the living creature for activity. Virtue, on the other hand, tends to be negative—it consists largely of "don't."

It is a legitimate challenge to those who take life seriously, to make virtue more dynamic, more entertaining, more alluring

than vice, instead of letting virtue consist merely in repressions and inhibitions. It sometimes must seem to the young that the white race has built up a civilization in which there is nothing interesting except "sin." It must rebuild.

Under the present system of education, which (if it teaches anything) teaches the negative virtue of continence instead of the positive, militant virtue of chastity, there has been a strong tendency to cramp the more docile young people into a condition of sterilized repression from which they could never recover; while the more resistant, vigorous, impulsive young people broke over the barriers and found the activity they craved in ways that were harmful both to themselves at the time and to society in general. It ought not to be difficult to provide the young with a regime that would give a normal outlet for the emotions and lead to a healthful, well-rounded development instead of to excess on one side or starvation on the other.

All sorts of open-air athletics, particularly those such as swimming and tennis in which both sexes take part, and all sorts of self-expression through art, may be counted on to help. A great danger of modern life is that people do not actively participate in their amusements: they sit silently, in the dark, while watching a film; applaud decorously once in a while at the theater; hear a symphony concert with dignified attention; or if they "let loose" a little more at a baseball game, yet fail to get one percent of the exercise that the players are getting. William James long ago called attention to the deep-seated evil of this condition, but it appears to be getting worse rather than better each year. Dancing (classical, folk, and social), amateur dramatics, and music afford means of self-expression that should be much more highly developed.

The emotions in general are thus given an outlet. The emotions concerned more particularly with marriage find their normal development in activities that are well recognized but have no satisfactory name. Flirtation is perhaps the best term available. It is as natural to young people as is eating or drinking, and while its manifestations sometimes distress the more esthetic or sophisticated minds of their elders, it is by no means to be repressed in-

discriminately, for it represents the method of trial and error by which boys and girls are acquiring and refining their ideals of mating. A certain amount of development of the tender emotion is necessary at this premarital period, and while it must be kept within bounds, it is just as bad not to let it go far enough, as to let it go too far.

Normally this age is outgrown within 10 years, as I have pointed out in a previous section. The period when one is more or less indiscriminately "boy crazy" or "girl crazy," as the case may be, is succeeded by the period when one selects a particular member of the opposite sex for life-long comradeship. The elderly philanthropist and male flirt is regarded with amused contempt by all women past the grammar school age, as representing a stage of arrested development.

The emotions concerned more particularly with childbearing and child-rearing find their normal outlet in the play of childhood, in care of younger brothers and sisters, and in help, as the child grows older, with all the family problems. Under the conditions of modern city life, opportunities for this sort of development are restricted. Much could be done, by the development of mothercraft, to give older girls an opportunity of coming into contact with little children and learning to care for them. There would be a wide field for remunerative employment, if places were available where mothers could leave their children under skilled supervision, for an occasional day or half-day, in order to free themselves for other occupations or amusement. Such places should be not exactly kindergartens, day nurseries, or clinics, but a combination of all three. I believe that most mothers of the well-to-do classes would patronize them, with benefit to themselves and their children as well as to the young women operating these institutions. Beyond this, the amount of charitable work of the same sort that could be done profitably for the children of families too poor to pay, is unlimited. Girls who now drift into teaching school, merely to occupy their time until they marry,¹ would find in such work as this

¹ Teachers sometimes ask of a woman unknown to them, whose name is mentioned in conversation, "Is she married, single, or teaching?" Pedagogy is universally recognized as representing what war-time draft boards called a deferred classification.

a more interesting and socially useful form of employment, and one that would give their own emotions a much more satisfactory outlet. It should be understood clearly, however, that it was not to furnish lifelong "careers" for women. (See the following section, Community Organization.)

Ellen Key and others have proposed that all young women give a year or more of compulsory service to the state, in the furtherance of motherhood, just as young men in Europe do their compulsory military service. Such a proposal would meet with little favor in the United States, where the principle of compulsory military service is not viewed with pleasure. There may be something to be said for it in Europe.

MATRIMONY

3. A frank, wholesome attitude toward matrimony in general, with fewer whispers and snickers, would be of great benefit. Particularly helpful, however, would be an active, though unofficial, assistance of young people in finding mates. Those who grow up in small communities find the way relatively easy: it is natural for them to marry comrades whom they meet at church, school, or club, or in the houses of friends, and whom they have known for years before marriage. But a large part of the marriageable population is now found in great cities, alone and friendless. These people want to marry as much as anyone else does, but their difficulty in meeting any large number of eligibles is appalling.

Men are nearly always generous in helping boys to get a start in business, but in the more important matter of starting a family there is general indifference, timidity, or fear of being ridiculed, of making a mistake, or of being considered a busybody. This does not apply in such full force to women—indeed, the matchmaking proclivities of mothers are proverbial. They are, however, too often selfish and limited. It is right enough that a woman should use every effort to marry off her own daughter, or some particular protégée, but what is needed is not so much the deliberate attempt to make a match, as it is the deliberate attempt to give young people a wider range of contacts with eligibles, so that they can

make matches for themselves under favorable conditions. There need be nothing ostentatious or embarrassing about such efforts. Most elderly people, if they were not too much wrapped up in their own affairs, would find immense pleasure in having around them a lot of superior young people, and in constantly seeking new ones of the same quality to add to the circle. In this way, the young man in a city, who now meets only the landlady's daughter and the girls in his own office; and the young woman in a city, who perhaps does not meet any young men at all, would have a fair chance to find mates, and not be driven into celibacy or, desperate, into snatching at the first unmarried person of the opposite sex who appeared on the horizon.

In another direction there is room for many changes in the concept of marriage, to satisfy the demands of those women who feel that the institution of matrimony is at present a cramping and confining one, in which the woman becomes a shackled dependent, losing all opportunity for freedom, individuality, self-expression, and creative work.

It is difficult to know how to meet, in every case, such demands—when they are sincere: for in many cases they are the mere defensive reaction or “sour grapes” snarl of the spinster, the divorcee, or the kept woman. The institution itself can scarcely be held responsible; for, being merely a status resulting from mutual contract, it is nothing more nor less than what the two persons concerned make it. In many cases it has been made an unlovely thing, through the ignorance or perversity of husband or wife or both; but the remedy is manifestly to be applied to each individual case, and not to the institution as an institution. So far as women's legal rights go, they are now in most states better secured than are those of men.

Beyond this, it is true that in nearly every modern marriage there is room for (a) more romance, (b) more understanding, (c) more freedom, (d) more courtesy, (e) more respect for personality, and (f) more opportunity for really living. Marriage should be and can be the greatest agent for promoting progress in all these directions. Nothing more is required, in most cases, than that the two

partners give serious thought to it, and this involves the whole subject of intelligent education for marriage, which has been insisted on more than once in this volume. Such matters as the necessity for a separate home (no house being large enough for two families), the interferences of relatives, particularly mothers-in-law, the desirability of a budget and fair division of the family income,—these and many other important topics of the same sort have been dealt with amply by other writers, and are thoroughly understood by everyone who has attended to them. But in respect of preparation, it should be remembered more commonly that love is an art, and is not to be learned by study of the failures and abnormalities that fill most sexual treatises, any more than painting or sculpture is to be learnt by living amidst wretched exhibitions of bad workmanship and never seeing a good statue or drawing. In practice, moreover, one should not expect the impossible of marriage—it is a human institution, subject to all the frailties of human nature.

Men must realize that their married life needs and should have at least as much attention as their business life. They must especially (a) allow more time for loving—it takes time; and (b) be ready to devote more time to their children. The man who thinks the greatest thing he can do for his family is to make a million dollars, has a wrong set of values. Even more mistaken is the man whose mind is set solely on attaining power or distinction. History is full of the remarks of men who, at the close of a life spent in the pursuit of fame, have described bitterly the futility and disillusionment of it all, agreeing with The Preacher that “All is vanity.” But I do not remember ever reading of a father who, after successfully bringing up a worthy family, expressed regret over a misspent life.

On the other hand, women probably err quite as often as men, in unwillingness to carry their share of the load. The merely decorative, parasite wife is a conspicuous feature of city life in this as in previous civilizations. The woman who thinks her husband’s only occupation and duty are to entertain her and gratify her whims is a frequent client of the divorce courts. The *hetairae* of ancient

Greece are reproduced in many professions and callings of present-day civilization by not a few attractive young women whose ambition it is to be "free," to charm men intellectually and emotionally; but of course, "no babies!"

The "woman problem" is a perennial one in human society. Some feminists talk as if woman had hitherto always been subjugated (save in a mythical matriarchal period, to which they look back with fond regret, when man was merely the obsequious servant of woman and tolerated only as a "biological necessity"). The fact is that in every civilization the question of woman's position has arisen in much the same acute way that it has during the last century. Details have varied with the form of civilization, but in essence the situation has been the same. At a certain point in any culture, the biological differentiation of the two sexes begins to be hampered by social and economic factors. Then a certain proportion of abnormal or ill-educated women begins to campaign for individualism and emancipation.

No historian has yet appeared to do justice to this recurrent phenomenon, but every high school student knows some of the outstanding facts, particularly as they developed in Rome, where conditions were in many ways strikingly parallel to those in modern occidental civilization. Feminism was one of the many biological factors involved in the downfall of the empire. It might be possible to defend the thesis that no civilization has ever been able to survive after the natural biological differentiation of the sexes was weakened.

Present-day civilization has in some respects a better chance of survival than had past civilizations, because there is now available a much larger body of data to establish the proper relationship of the sexes. Any unprejudiced inquirer ought to be able to satisfy himself that "emancipation" as understood by extreme feminists means not emancipation but slavery; that freedom is to be found only in a situation where the individual is not working in opposition to his or her own inborn dispositions. Self-realization, for men and women alike, can not be found in a celibate or pseudo-celibate, money-making, notoriety-seeking career; but in the normal satis-

factions of family life to which men and women are adapted by countless generations of organic evolution.

CHILDBEARING

4. Cornelia Stratton Parker tells of receiving a call, while with her husband at Harvard, from some Boston woman who learned that she had a child in arms and another on the way. "How interesting!" exclaimed the visitor, in all seriousness. "Just like the slums."

Speaking by and large, the attitude of the public toward child-birth may be said to embrace the following ideas:

(a) That for a child to be born within a year of the wedding day is both funny and vulgar.

(b) That to have many children is both an evidence of bad taste and an indication of carelessness.

(c) That the sight of a pregnant woman is a matter either for ridicule or for pity, the public being about equally divided in this respect.

These are points on which clear thinking and plain speaking should be the care of responsible people. Theodore Roosevelt did not hesitate publicly and vigorously to rebuke those who took this attitude toward childbearing. Others may well follow his example.

At one period in early Rome, the door of a pregnant woman was always crowned with garlands; while in early Greece her home was a sanctuary in which the accused could take inviolate refuge. It is not necessary to bring back old customs: it ought to be possible to invent some new ones. Jules Michelet desired that every man who passed a pregnant woman on the street should take off his hat to her; as to which Gaston Rageot justly remarks that taken literally, the suggestion is bad manners; taken figuratively, it is far from enough.

On the other hand, discrimination is important. Childbearing, of itself, is not necessarily praiseworthy; and the pregnant woman, although to be treated with consideration in every case, is by no means always to be admired. The only childbearing worthy of

commendation is the bearing of good children under proper circumstances. A mere sentimental attitude toward maternity encourages the multiplication of some highly undesirable types. Moreover, as soon as maternity is considered a merit in itself, without any qualifications, the way is open to put irresponsible, unmarried motherhood on the same level with motherhood in a family. While one can not always draw a sharp line and say, this motherhood is to be praised, that to be condemned, yet those who care for the conservation of the family will bear in mind the supreme importance of quality.

INTERFERING CONDITIONS

5. Among the means of forming public opinion and guiding action, art and literature stand high. A scrutiny of present tendencies in these fields in the United States is disquieting to any one interested in the conservation of family life.

Almost all of current fiction, poetry,² drama, and motion-pictures is highly individualistic, and not in any way evolutionary. Much of it is frankly eroticism or fantasy, poor food for the mind of man or beast.

Standard published fiction is bad enough, much of it being written by "those modern beggars for fame, who," in Thomas Babington Macaulay's phrase, "extort a pittance from the compassion of the inexperienced by exposing the nakedness and sores of their minds." But modern magazines are perhaps worse. The level of many of them has sunk markedly during the past decade, while there have sprung into existence several new classes of periodical of sinister import: the small, frankly pornographic and obscene monthly, published in some obscure country town, shipped by express to avoid postal censorship, and sold for 25 cents to any passer-by; the more pretentious magazine which prints porno-

² To cite a couple of instances at random, two of the most widely accepted singers of love are Laurence Hope (Mrs. Malcolm H. Nicolson) and Sara Teasdale (Mrs. Ernst B. Filsinger). The former's motif is the evanescence of passion; the latter's refrain is the failure of reality to satisfy her as do her day dreams. A sound mind can not be nourished long by such stuff.

graphic material under the guise of bogus "confessions" and false "true stories;" and the "Peppery Stories" type which specializes in aphrodisiacal fiction.

Such magazines can nearly always be suppressed without much trouble by the force of public opinion, with legal action where necessary. No one is seriously interested in defending them, aside from those who make a living by pandering to the lowest tastes of mankind, save a few professional zealots for "personal liberty." The latter are active and vociferous, but analysis usually shows that their idea of personal liberty is liberty to get drunk, liberty to enjoy lascivious literature, and liberty to commit fornication. Such a program will hardly prevail with thoughtful people.

Objectionable dramas and films can be dealt with by the same means as objectionable books and magazines. If people who are coaxed by misrepresentation into a salacious entertainment would get up and walk out, complaining at the box office and demanding the return of their money, they might not get the money but they would soon change the point of view of the box office.

Modern commercialism has at least one redeeming feature: it offers a tender spot for attack in the case of anti-social productions. The pandering showman or back-alley publisher whose musical comedy or book is obscene usually protests frantically, when cornered, that he has property rights in the production, which must not be jeopardized. Any interference, he wails, will cause him to lose good money he has invested. Such squeals should be sweet music to those attempting to provide decent surroundings for their families. Vigorous community action that will not only impair, but will totally destroy, the investment is the surest preventive of further insults. The solar plexus of these promoters is located in the pocketbook and they will always succumb to a blow there. The more of them that can be bankrupted, the fewer recruits will appear to take their places.

While the great majority of showmen and the like are amenable to public opinion, if it is adequately represented, a minority must be dealt with by legal measures. A difficulty often arises in the proposition that what is objectionable for one audience is useful

for another. A group of physicians may discuss or publish material that would only disturb a group of high school boys who lack the background that the physicians have to connect up this material with other knowledge. A nude woman may pose without offense for a group of artists when she could not, in the present unregenerate state of public opinion, pose on a crowded street corner. The law fully recognizes this common-sense distinction, and it would give little trouble if it were not pushed too far by those who have no legitimate excuse for using it. Everyone knows the type of "artist" who has no interest in art that wears clothes,³ and the type of "scientist" who is devoted to the study of "Sex," but knows nothing of the normal phenomena that make up 99 percent of sexual life. Neither art nor science is benefited by the activity of these parasites, and the professions themselves should take steps to purge their ranks of those who are merely using them as a cloak for their own purposes.

³ A large proportion of creative artists notoriously does not conform to accepted standards of conduct, and it has sometimes been supposed that the atmosphere in which they are educated is to blame. Such an explanation puts the cart before the horse. The fact is that many, if not all, people have within them some potentiality for creative art, but in most it fails of expression because of the repressions, suppressions, resistances, and inhibitions that form so large (and within limits, so necessary) a part of the human mental equipment. One can not become a creative artist unless one lacks these hindrances to a large extent, but their lack is almost certain to be manifested in conduct as well as in other forms of self-expression.

Beyond this, there are various special factors in particular cases. Actors, for example, have from time immemorial been prone to deviate from the standards of sexual conduct. Their frequent travels are unfavorable to family life; in addition, the constant pretence of "making love" on the stage tends to form action patterns in the mind that inevitably guide conduct off the stage.

All this is not to argue that artists should be regarded as in a class by themselves, living above all ordinary rules of conduct. But it does argue that there is a price to be paid for creative work. Society decides whether the price is too high for the work. Often it is; and then an Oscar Wilde or a Stanford White dies in disgrace. Undue tolerance of the eccentricities of creative artists produces an infestation of posers and fakers, of hobohemians, Greenwich Villagers, and movie extras, whose only claim to be considered artists is the irregularity of their matings.

All this does not mean any objection to frankness and plain speaking on any subject. Indeed, much plainer speaking than is now customary would be beneficial. Was it Confucius who said that if things were always called by their right names, most of the evils in the world would disappear? It is the euphemy, the representation of evil things as attractive, that is harmful. If a prostitute were always called a prostitute, whether she be a penniless street walker or a Madame de Pompadour, instead of being referred to as a light o' love, *fille de joie*, fair but frail charmer, or what not, the effect on public opinion would be salutary. The same holds true of all other evil conditions which interfere with the normal functioning of the family.

No one objects to plain speaking so long as it is in the right place. The desire of modern young people to get rid of cant, hypocrisy, and outworn conventions is one of the most hopeful things in civilization. But more pains must be taken to distinguish between these things and fundamental biological requirements. It is a pity that any one should be so ill-educated as to look at matters rooted in the deepest biological facts, in the depths of woman's nature or in the inevitable course of evolution, and pronounce them mere conventions, tyrannies of man-made society, or fossil customs of a priest-ridden civilization.

A crucial instance is furnished from time to time when some prominent man goes off with a woman who is not his wife. The Russian writer Maxim Gorki came to the United States some years ago with a mistress who was, in accordance with the law, refused admission at Ellis Island. Votaries of Personal Liberty promptly grew raucous, but the response of almost every class of society, from the President down, was equally prompt and decisive. Mr. Gorki finally came into the country, leaving his mistress behind, only to find himself generally ostracised, until he returned hastily to his native land.

Another illustration is furnished now and then when some professional man, perhaps of international note, goes off with a soul-mate, is dismissed from his position, and finds his professional career blighted if not wholly ruined. Many well-meaning persons

have deplored these incidents, arguing that these men could have done much for the advancement of science and the progress of civilization, and that to put an end to this possibility, by ostracism, shows a strange blindness of society to its own best interests, or such a lack of perspective as leads one to cut off one's nose to spite one's face.

Such superficial comments wholly miss the real significance of these incidents, which I have here recalled because it is highly important that their significance be understood. In thrusting out from its precincts these men of great ability, society is not necessarily passing judgment on the motives that led to their actions. Individually, they may have been wholly justified in their own eyes, or in the eyes of those most familiar with the facts. But the outstanding fact is that monogamy represents an adaptation of society—that is, a condition necessary to promote growth and harmony; an adaptation that has been developed during and has, on the whole, stood the test of hundreds of thousands of years. It is of incomparably greater importance to society that monogamy be maintained than it is that any one man, no matter how great his achievements, should continue to practice his profession. The extrusion of deviates from its ranks is part of the price that society pays for maintaining an institution of transcendent value, and no one with an evolutionary point of view will suppose for a moment that the price is too great. Evolution can not go on without the sacrifice of some—indeed, of many—individuals. The more primitive and bloody methods of evolution which prevailed in an earlier age, and which were accompanied by the sudden death of deviates from the standard, have been largely set aside in favor of more rational and less violent methods. Nowadays the man who does not conform to the necessary standards is usually not killed (barring occasional enforcement of “the unwritten law”—an enforcement which is in some ways salutary, even though not approvable in principle); he is merely pushed aside, ostracised, cast out of the social body. Disinterested persons, while regretting that there should be deviations that must thus be dealt with, should be glad that when they occur, they are so dealt with; while the

individual at fault may well rejoice that he was not born in an earlier age, when he and his consort might have been buried alive together.

Scientifically, there is no room for a plea that the hostile attitude of society toward those who break the most important mores should be relaxed. If the mores are out of date, they should be changed on the basis of research and adequate evidence; but so long as they stand, it is too much to ask that any strong and healthy society shall consent to commit suicide by tolerating anarchy. There are already plenty of illustrations in history, of the results that follow such a course; and while it is doubtless true in detail that history never repeats itself, yet similar causes will tend to produce similar effects. It is no coincidence that the downfall of both Greece and Rome was preceded by a laxity of the marriage mores, and a disregard for the interest of the family.

In this connection the responsibility of each individual is heavy: (a) to arrive at sound standards of conduct, (b) to adhere to them personally, and (c) to stand up for them publicly and make his influence felt. The last-named obligation is the one on which I wish particularly to insist in this section. Even trivial actions have an importance, the extent of which can not be foreseen. The man who tells, or approves the telling of, a joke which justifies marital infidelity is doing just as much harm as is the woman who allows her children to get their standards of home-life from the so-called funny papers. Motion pictures too often bear out H. L. Mencken's cynical contention that from them children can learn only patriotism and adultery. Parents who tolerate such things can not expect their children to do otherwise. Influential people who tolerate them can not expect that the crowd will not follow their example.

After reproduction and fighting and hunger, there are few motives stronger in human life than the desire to think well of one's self, and to be well thought of by others. It is to this motive that appeal must be made, for the conservation of the family. Most people are necessarily followers, not leaders; the few who by accident or merit are leaders therefore have a double obligation to

stand on the biological side of all issues which involve family life; for their actions will be read about, watched, commented on, and consciously or unconsciously imitated by thousands. The crowd will speak respectfully of family life, if those after whom it patterns speak respectfully of family life; on the other hand, it will think prostitution necessary and adultery amusing if its models take that attitude. For this, among other reasons, law enforcement and social ostracism, as well as more constructive measures, should begin at the top, not the bottom, of the social scale.

III. ECONOMIC REFORMS

In the establishment and maintenance of a family, dollars and cents frequently cast the deciding vote. They have a voice in man's or woman's decision to marry, in the first place. After that, the family's resources, its standard of living, and its hope of providing for old age, largely govern the number of children born and play a significant, though minor, part in determining the fate of the children, once they have come into the world.¹

Except among people who face actual starvation, it is true that almost anyone can afford children if he wants to—it merely means giving up something else. Most of the people who economize by giving up progeny would not suffer from privation, if they had offspring, nor would these children have to go without anything necessary to their comfort. The statement of well-to-do people that they can not afford children means simply that they are unwilling to deprive themselves of certain luxuries for the sake of children, or that they could not continue to live in the same extravagant style as their neighbors or associates, if they had children.

Here is evidently one way in which a reform is possible. People can cultivate simpler tastes.

But this is not enough. In many circles, a certain standard of

¹ Within limits the care that a child gets is dependent on the ability of his parents to pay for care. This item, which has been exaggerated grossly by many writers, and in nearly all the investigations of the United States Children's Bureau, must be interpreted in the light of two facts. First, the multiplication of charitable agencies in large cities often ensures to the children of the poor better care than those of the moderately well-to-do can receive. Secondly, the income of the parents reflects to some extent their inherent capacity, intelligence, health, and the like; so that the greater infant mortality rate sometimes found among families where the income is small reflects to a corresponding extent the ignorance, incompetence, and physical defects of the parents, rather than the size of their bank balance. It is an error to suppose that by doubling the wages of all tenement-house dwellers, one could cut down the infant mortality among them by a corresponding amount.

living is practically obligatory. A man can not hold his position unless he and his wife conform with that standard. Moreover, in every superior family it is desirable that the children have, not merely a bare margin of subsistence, but every advantage possible. There is, then, real need for measures that will aid families with children.

As has been shown previously, the birth rate tends to diminish as the family income increases. The more money a man has, the fewer children. An ideal solution of the problem would be such changes as would (a) make people's incomes represent accurately their real value to the community, and (b) would make them bear and rear a number of children proportional to their income. Such an ideal solution will never be reached, but it is worth a moment's consideration.

(a) Every movement in the direction of social justice tends to favor the more accurate adjustment of income to real value. All laws to prevent sharp and fraudulent practice in business, and providing for truthful advertising, weighing, and measuring, for instance, help in this direction. Heavy taxes on unapprovable luxuries and on large inheritances act in the same direction. At present a man of mediocre intellect and superior physique may, as a result of a 40-minute prize fight, make enough money to pay the salaries of an entire college faculty for a year. A man with intellect and physique both of mediocre quality, but endowed with a certain amount of avarice, unscrupulousness, ferocity, and tenacity, can gain an equal amount of money by performances of a different kind that are even less useful socially. Any measures that tend to eliminate such discrepancies will benefit the family indirectly. To go into further details under this head would, however, be to write a treatise on economics.

(b) The birth rate can be made to correspond more nearly to the income, by a decrease in the families of the poor and an increase in the families of the well-to-do. Such a change could conceivably be brought about by education, the pressure of public opinion, and in general all the measures which have been discussed in this volume.

Within narrow limits, then, some approach may be made toward the ideal solution mentioned above.

Most suggested solutions, however, have proceeded from the opposite side and, assuming that the number of children produced is one of the indications of a family's value to the community, have attempted to devise means for making the income correspond to the number of children, rather than, as was suggested above, to make the number of children correspond to a readjusted income.

The premise, that children form one of the real evidences of a family's value to the community, is sound within certain limits. It is particularly unassailable when the comparison is made inside of any given class. For the sake of illustration one might take all postmasters, or all railway engineers, or all bankers: on the average it would be safe to say that those with good-sized families are worth more to the nation than those who are unmarried or who have inadequate families. Within a given class, therefore, any measure which tends to redistribute income on the basis of size of family is, up to a certain point, eugenic. But if the distribution is made more broadly, on the basis of the entire population, the procedure becomes questionable.

It must be admitted that many of the proposals for increasing the birth-rate through economic measures show a pathetically trustful faith in the omnipotence of the dollar. Just as wealth is commonly supposed to open all doors to its possessor; just as the successful pork packer or war profiteer feels no doubt of his ability to purchase culture, social position, a noble (though somewhat sketchy) pedigree relating him to William the Conqueror, and a duke for a son-in-law; so, if the state desires an increased output of children, it is told that it has only to go into the open market and bid for them. Are more babies needed? Your esteemed inquiry received and contents noted, and in reply would say, make the price right and said items will be delivered C.O.D., 280 days after receipt of order.

Surely the population problem is not quite so simple as that!

It may be true that the state can secure quantity production any time it is willing to outbid competitors. But quantity produc-

tion of children is the last thing that is needed in modern civilization.

There is, however, another and more sympathetic side to the picture. If parents want children, but are hindered from having them by the existence of artificial, economic barriers, the state may well remove the barriers, if it is possible to do so, and if it appears that eugenically superior parents will be benefited more than will the inferior.

Broadly speaking, it may be said that proposals to readjust the birth-rate by punishing the childless offer little hope of success. Such measures were tried in imperial Rome, without avail, and they are no more likely to succeed now.

Again, attempts to alter the birth-rate by bribing the childless are likewise fallacious.

It is proper, as was noted above, to remove hindrances to child-bearing, in certain cases. But in any case, it is likely that the most valuable result of most economic reforms will be indirect, not direct. Any financial relief that is given will be tangible; but the important result would be, through such reforms, to make fathers and mothers feel that they occupy an important place in the world; that they are recognized by the state, and by their fellow-citizens, as having done something worth while; that they are good citizens, and universally acknowledged to be such. Economic measures of even minor direct influence may be of real value, in this indirect way.

With these principles in mind, the following attempts to solve the population problem in one way or another are particularly worthy of thought.

THE MINIMUM WAGE

1. The concept of the Minimum Wage is a vague one, used in various senses. In one sense it is purely an individual wage.

Some schemers for a reorganized society propose a "pauper's wage," a pittance large enough to keep a man alive, if no more. Thus, even an individual who did not care to work would not have to starve to death.

But the doctrine which commonly goes under the simple title

of Minimum Wage is in reality a proposal to subsidize families. It provides that every laborer shall receive income sufficient to support not only himself but a wife and at least three children. It is assumed that this is the average size of family, and it is urged that society owes to every family at least enough money to keep its members alive.

Such a theory will not stand analysis. In the first place, the average worker does not have a family of this size to support. Paul H. Douglas has calculated that such a wage would mean supporting 47,000,000 fictitious dependents in the United States; while if "equal pay for equal work" brings women the same wage, it will mean supporting some 70,000,000 imaginary persons.

Obviously, neither industry nor eugenics can tolerate such a fiction. To make pay apply to size of family, society must proceed directly by counting heads, not indirectly by hypothesis.

But beyond this, is it desirable that society give every man the means of supporting a wife and three children? Certainly not. In many cases it is desirable that he be unable to support them,—if it appears, for instance, that the children he would have would be a detriment to the state, rather than a gain.

Whatever its purely economic merits may be, the idea of a minimum wage as commonly understood is directly opposed to every aspect of a sound theory of population. Free competition may be tempered to the extent of furnishing every man enough charity to feed him, if he requires charity for that purpose, and to feed his family, if he already has one. But charity which will subsidize him to increase his family, if he is too inefficient to support it by his own exertions, would be of little benefit to the family or the state.

THE FAMILY WAGE

2. The Family Wage idea has spread rapidly in Europe since the war. It exists in a great variety of forms, the essential theory of all of which is that a father is rendering certain services to his country, beyond his mere daily labor, and that in addition to fair remuneration for his daily work he should be given extra remuneration for this other service, in proportion to the amount of service rendered.

Among the countries in which this system has been put into effect on a large or small scale are Australia, Austria, Belgium, Czecho-Slovakia, Denmark, France, Germany, Holland, Norway, Poland, and Switzerland. In some countries it is confined, or nearly limited, to state employees.

The practice is more widespread in France than in any other nation. There (1924) some 3,000,000 workers are covered by it, in many different forms. The law of July 22, 1923, provides an annual allowance of f.90 (\$17.37 at par, but at that time actually only \$5 or \$6) for each child under 13 years of age in excess of three in the family. Beyond this, various groups of employers have made special provision for payments, by forming pools in which all in a given industry, or branch of an industry, contribute. These are so arranged that the burden is equalized, and no employer is tempted for his own advantage to discriminate against married men, when taking on new hands. There is no uniform system of payments in the employers' funds. Among the methods of distribution are:

- (a) Increased allowance for second and subsequent children.
- (b) Same allowance for each child.
- (c) No allowance for first child, or first two children, but high allowances for subsequent ones.
- (d) Same (rather low) allowance for first two children, increased allowance for subsequent ones.
- (e) High allowance for first, or first two, and lower for subsequent children.

Allowances have ranged from f.10 to f.50 per month for the first child, and from f.5 to f.100 for the fourth.

Inasmuch as all children, and all families, differ in quality, and therefore in value to the state, it is clear that any system which pays an equal sum for all children is merely a baby bounty, and that it will tend on the whole to produce quantity at the expense of quality. Such a system has no place in any program for the conservation of the family.

Again, any system that differentiates between the first born and the later born is apparently nothing but an attempt to favor

mass production. It is likely to produce mass but not much else, particularly as the bounties given are in most cases mere pittance, which could be of real value only to families at the bottom of the social scale.

On the other hand, any system which recognizes inherent differences by making the allowance depend both on the size of the family and on the basal pay of the father is open to fewer objections. It is one of the fairest ways that can be devised for subsidizing the family. If, for example (to take purely arbitrary figures), a man's pay were increased by 20 percent on marriage, and by an additional 10 percent on the birth of each child, the difference in the amount received by a \$2 a day man and a \$10 a day man, each with a wife and four children, would be marked.

Unfortunately, the introduction of such differential treatment is usually opposed by the inefficient who, being a great majority, have the most voting power, and have to be placated by politicians who would stay in office. It is, however, in effect among civil service employees in Holland, and in a few other groups.

The payment of family wages by the state to all workers is justified on the ground that families of the right kind are necessary to the state, and that the superior man and wife who produce four or five children have rendered a service to the state which is as much worth compensation as any other contribution to public welfare.

The payment by industrial employers to their own workmen is justified not only by patriotism, but on the ground that the production of children means the production of suitable labor, and that the family man is a more dependable, permanent man than is the single worker. In France, says Mary T. Waggaman, "Without pretending to relieve the state from its duty toward large families, heads of firms and corporations consider that the interest they manifest in improving family life ought to promote industrial prosperity. Just as they insure against fire and accidents they also consider as part of their expenses a sum for the purpose of establishing greater labor stability. In thus interesting themselves in the workers' families and contributing to the physical and mental

development of the workers' children, these employers hope to provide themselves a future superior labor reserve which will do away with the supplementary foreign and colonial labor to which they have had recourse these later years. Some of the fund members declare that these advantages permit them to compete favorably with districts which have not yet adopted the institution of family allowances."

The weight to be attached to these arguments will be decided differently by different people. I have seen no mention of the argument that the family man produces future consumers, and therefore might properly be subsidized by a corporation which makes its profits from selling consumers goods.

BABY BOUNTIES

3. Baby bounties have been dealt with incidentally under the preceding head. They are wrong in principle and should not be countenanced in any form.

PREFERENTIAL EMPLOYMENT

4. Preferential employment of family men is a close correlative of the family wage system. It might be possible to rule that in the civil service, for example, a position will not be given to an unmarried man or woman, if there is available for the place a family man equally qualified. This would be a legitimate and useful procedure.

If such preferential treatment were not accompanied by a family wage, there would be no reason why intelligent and public-spirited private employers should not adopt the same measure. It would cost them no more (save as industrial compensation for accidents is greater for a family man). If family wages were also allowed, a narrow-minded employer might prefer to give a vacant position to a bachelor, because he could be had more cheaply.

MATERNITY BENEFITS

5. Maternity benefits, often advocated, have been applied in some countries to a limited extent. When they amount to merely

a lump sum, given every woman at childbirth, they are only another name for a baby bounty. In the case of married women workers, payment of at least part of the normal wage during the last month before and the first month or two after confinement permits the mother to take needed rest and to get the necessary care for herself and her newborn child. This is helpful to the individual; whether it is in the long run beneficial to the state depends partly on what kind of children such mothers produce. On the whole, such a system, if applied in a discriminating way, probably does more good than harm.

If applied to wage-earners, administration of a system of maternity benefits is simple, because the earning capacity of the women is known definitely. Many feminists, however, have proposed to push this idea farther, by having the state recognize childbearing as a service equal in value to any other and give a salary to all women engaged in that occupation. This at once brings difficulties of administration, for the great bulk of mothers, never having worked outside the home, have no fixed earning capacity. Publicity has been given recently to an estimate that the average farmer's wife in the United States is worth approximately \$4,000 a year to her family, taking account of services actually rendered. While few intelligent farmers would think this estimate high enough, an attempt to remunerate the wives at this rate, when they were bearing children, might cause at least a mild protest from the cave-dwellers of the metropolis!

Under present conditions of public sentiment and politics, it would certainly be impossible to get mothers graded and classified on the basis of their real worth to the community, and paid accordingly. Any measure that could possibly be passed would undoubtedly provide only a lump sum for every mother, as is the case elsewhere, and would therefore be highly objectionable.

The family wage, paid to the man of the house on the basis of a percentage of his own established earning capacity, achieves the same end, and is much more practicable. The most prevalent arrangement in existing, normal households is that the husband earns, the wife spends the family income. On the whole, this

system seems to work well, and it is difficult to see how any other system can be compatible with woman's specialization for child-bearing.

MOTHERS' PENSIONS

6. Mothers' pensions, applying to those who have lost their husbands by death or desertion, are now provided in most American states. They furnish a sum of from \$100 to \$200 per child per year, up to the time the children are from 14 to 18, depending on the state. They are therefore not strictly eugenic, but may be valuable in keeping children with their own mothers and out of institutions.

FAMILY INSURANCE

7. Family insurance in some form has been suggested by numerous writers, particularly in the United States by Hilda H. Noyes. It is argued that people insure to provide themselves with necessary assistance in case of accident or ill health; why not in the same way plan for help at time of childbirth, making small payments over a series of years, and withdrawing a larger sum on the birth of offspring?

The suggestion has interesting possibilities, although no actuary, so far as I know, has yet pronounced on its practicability.

Dr. Noyes has suggested another form of insurance in the following words:

"In this country the graduates of our best universities delay marriage for from seven to nine years after graduation, and average less than two children each, although it is necessary for those who become parents to have over three surviving children to keep the stock from dying out. The postponement of marriage is due, in the majority of cases, to insufficient income in the early years of becoming established in a business or professional career. To enable these picked individuals to marry earlier why not reverse the ordinary plan of insurance, in which a small sum is paid into the company for a long series of years and at death a large sum is paid to relatives and friends, and in its stead let the company advance the large sums first, in quarterly or monthly instalments

for a short series of years, decreasing gradually to nothing as the earning capacity of the applicant increased, then let him pay into the company a small sum for a long series of years? The result would be that the aggregate of the small payments coming in would equal the aggregate of the large payments going out plus the necessary expense of management and allowance for failure of payment in case of death of applicant. A necessary feature would be the investigation of the mental, moral, and physical heredity and status of the applicant to determine the quality of the risk. If the plan could be made to work economically, its eugenic influence would be great."

She has further suggested that part of the capital necessary for such a scheme might be supplied by endowment from some philanthropist. Andrew Carnegie provided a fund to allow certain college professors to live comfortably in their old age. Some one else might well provide another fund to allow them to bring up children comfortably in their youth.

Some of the difficulties of working out such a policy as this are obvious, but it is one of the most interesting suggestions that has been made in connection with the economic side of family life, and deserves thorough study.

It has also been proposed that a universal and compulsory scheme of insurance for child-bearing be patterned on the plan of compulsory old-age pensions in Germany and elsewhere, the state providing part of the capital, the individual the rest. Any universal and compulsory scheme, however, seems likely to be indiscriminate in its operation, as it would necessarily be more or less under political influence. Moreover, less efficient people would be more likely to want to get their money back by producing children. A plan of voluntary insurance, on the other hand, would be patronized only by the prudent, thrifty, and far-sighted, —exactly the classes whose reproduction is most desirable.

TAXATION

8. Taxation is now used to some extent in most countries for the encouragement of the family. The exemptions of the federal

income tax in the United States are familiar to every reader who has a wife and children.

As a more sweeping measure it has often been proposed to tax heavily all bachelors. But it is not desirable that all bachelors marry, still less that all have children; and any tax might have the tendency to force into marriage, and probable parenthood, those who should remain single for the good of all concerned. It has also been proposed to tax all childless people, whether married or single, with the idea that they could thus be forced to have children and, on the other hand, that funds from this source could be applied to reducing the burden of families.

To test this measure, one should analyze childless marriages. Leaving out of consideration those who are physiologically infertile, it will be evident that most childless married couples fall into one of the following three classes:

(a) Those who think that they should not have children because of some inherited disability—for instance, the presence of insanity in the ancestry.

(b) Those who can not, or think they can not, afford to have children.

(c) Those who do not want children because frivolous, selfish, ill-educated, or over-ambitious.

It is generally supposed that class (b) is the largest. Therefore the tax would fall most heavily on this class, made up of people who are childless merely because they think they have not the money at the moment to take good care of children. While they are enduring this situation, the tax collector arrives and informs them that, not having enough money to have a child right away, they must be mulcted of a part of the little they have—thereby pushing their baby still farther into the future. A valuable measure, indeed, for increasing the birth rate!

As to class (c), made up of those who are merely too selfish or ambitious to want to be bothered with children, it is supposed that they might by this pecuniary pressure be forced to produce children as a means of reducing their tax assessments. The wealthy among

them would certainly not be effectively influenced in this way;² and as for the poor climbers, sacrificing parenthood to the desire for a standard of living they can not afford, it is doubtful whether the children that they might produce under pecuniary pressure would be any great asset to the race. In so far as childlessness is due to *inborn* lack of parental feeling or other selfish trait, it should be encouraged, for the quicker such a trait is bred out of the race, the better. The prevalent degree of race suicide has at least one compensation, in that it is leading to the extinction of some family stocks that are inherently abnormal, yet in an earlier age would probably have left offspring to inherit their defect. On the other hand, that part of childlessness (probably a much larger part) which is found among people who are by nature normal and whose defects are due solely to education, is not a racial benefit but a racial disaster.

Finally, what effect would this taxation have on class (a), the defectives? In so far as it worked at all, its inevitable effect would be to tend to make these people have children, which is exactly what society does not want them to do.

It must be evident to anyone who analyzes the question more than superficially, that a tax on childlessness as a means for increasing the number of births of desirable children is a measure that would defeat its own ends. Even now, with all the maladjustments that exist, it can scarcely be doubted that the married people of the nation are, on the average, inherently superior in quality to those who have not married; and that the married people with children are, on the whole, superior in racial value to the childless married. What is needed is a revision of popular standards of value, and a change in public sentiment, so that the personal and racial advantages of a family of superior children will be more highly regarded.

² J. Swinburne has made the paradoxical proposal that a heavy tax be placed on children. Rich people would then have offspring as an evidence of their solvency, while the poor would forego this luxury. The proposal at least has more merit than a good many which have been made for the supposed benefit of the family.

This is not to say that taxation has no place among measures for the conservation of the family: it has an important place, but it must be applied in more delicate and discriminating ways than are proposed in the naïve plan of a general tax on the childless. The ultimate object (which can be attained only to a limited degree) must be to make income correspond more closely to the real eugenic and social value of the individual than it does at present; then, in a proper state of public opinion, people will tend to have, and be able to afford, children in proportion to their income and therefore in proportion to their inherent eugenic worth.

Moderate exemptions from taxation are justifiable for all married people—say \$2,000 for a wife, and \$2,000 for each child; and the tax should be steeply graded for incomes above something like \$20,000, as large incomes tend to cut down childbearing by introducing a multiplicity of competing interests and cares. Heavy inheritance taxes are desirable, but they should be proportioned not only to the amount each beneficiary receives, but also to the nearness of kin of the legatee (a plan already in effect in some states); thus a man might leave \$50,000 to each of his sons and daughters without heavy taxation, but an old bachelor who left \$50,000 to an adventuress or a spiritualist medium might expect that this sum would be much diminished before it reached its destination. This is the point at which society may most easily and usefully take a financial contribution from the childless. Severe taxes on unapprovable luxuries and harmful commodities are also useful.

In some respects the recent trend of taxation in the United States has been favorable to the eugenic point of view; in others it seems now to be in the opposite direction. Thus the demand is growing for a reduction in the surtaxes on large incomes, and for lower inheritance taxes, on the ground that such decreases are necessary to keep business good.

Taxation being an economic function, the biologist is not in a position to do more than point out the possible results it may have on biological features of society. Doubtless a compromise is necessary between the economic and the biologic claims. If the

reasoning in the foregoing discussion is sound, it appears that the state might some day find it was keeping business going at the expense of families. In that case, opinion (both public and expert) would have to decide whether it preferred to sacrifice the home to business, or business to the home; or whether a satisfactory adjustment of conflicting claims could be reached.

“BACK TO THE FARM”

9. Of all the economic measures, the “back to the farm” movement is in some ways the most important. It is the birth rate in cities that offers the real menace to society. Country parents mostly still feel able to indulge the normal human inclination for several children. The growing industrialization of rural districts must therefore be watched with a jealous eye.

The crowding of population into large cities complicates the situation in ways that are familiar to all. In the first place, it is difficult to find a satisfactory place to live, at a reasonable price, if one has many children. In the second place, children are a greater expense in the city than in the country because more is desired for them. The cost of food, of clothing, of servants, of amusements, of medical attention, all tend to be higher in the city, largely because of the higher standards that are maintained. In the third place, children can not contribute to the family as they do on the farm, where the girls help with the housework and the boys with the chores outside. The latter are non-existent and the former almost negligible in an apartment. In the fourth place, there is a greater number of competing interests in the city, all of them attractive, all of them consuming time if not money and therefore having to be balanced against children.

Every measure that tends to make rural, or at least suburban, life more comfortable and accessible is indirectly a measure for the conservation of the family.

In this particular, progress now seems to be fairly favorable, for more and more families are moving to the suburbs for the sake of their children, and many students foresee an era of urban decentral-

ization, when the present anti-social aggregations of population will be broken up or opened out, allowing a larger proportion of people to live under the conditions of health, decency, and comfort that are necessary for the welfare of the family.

IV. COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

Community organizations, either existing or to be created, public or private, may profitably endeavor, among other things, to (1) provide education fitting people for family life, (2) promote marriage, (3) make the care of the home easier for women, (4) increase the reproduction of superior parents, (5) decrease that of inferior parents, (6) provide care for children, not only for their own benefit but for that of their parents, (7) augment the facilities for recreation for persons of all ages, and (8) repress or eradicate conditions that hinder the normal functioning of the family, particularly commercialized evils.

Most communities are now overorganized in many respects, and there are organizations which deal with most of the foregoing topics, in one way or another. Many of these are so well established and known that I shall not refer to them, or at most give them only passing mention.

EDUCATION FOR FAMILY LIFE

1. Education has been dealt with at some length in Section I of this Part; here I will only emphasize the need of some direct means of education for young people who are preparing to marry and who have not previously had the kind of training they need. Most persons about to wed, particularly young women, realize all too keenly their lack of preparation; but there are no adequate facilities for remedying this. In many large cities there are schools of domestic science, but the hours and tuition do not always make these available for girls who are earning their own living. Most agricultural colleges give "Short Courses" in home economics, and these are often patronized to good effect by girls preparing to marry, but they again are available only to a limited number. Girls living at home can do much without leaving it, and it is often astonishing to see the zeal with which a girl who has hitherto

showed few domestic tastes will begin to assist her mother in the housekeeping and cooking, after she is betrothed.

To supplement such means as these, it would seem to be entirely feasible to use the high schools to a greater extent for adult classes and night work in this field, pending the time when all girls will receive proper instruction as a part of their early education, and will not have to return, some years after leaving school, to make up the deficiency. Home making should be taught in every phase; but mothercraft, which is usually slighted, is vastly more important than cookery, which is usually emphasized. It is not so serious if a young wife feeds indigestible biscuits to her husband as if she feeds the same biscuits to her baby.

While the old idea still exists, that beneficent Nature has planted in the minds of her children instincts which will furnish all necessary guidance for home-making, it is no longer held by rational people, and there ought to be enough of these in the United States to make a start in systematic education for family life outside of, or as an expansion of, the present school system. Austria has recently made provision whereby any woman who wishes to do so can get a diploma as a housewife, by passing examinations set by the high school. Apart from the usual home work and verbal and written examinations, there is also a practical test which deals with the care and education of children and includes the preparation of a complete meal. It is easy to imagine the development of such an idea along most practical and useful lines.¹

The way in which some thoughtful women regard this subject is illustrated by the results of a questionnaire circulated through the American Home department of the California Federation of Women's Clubs in 1925. In answer to the question "Are you satisfied with the present-day home?", 5 percent answered yes, 95 percent no.

"What, in your opinion, are the causes within the home which

¹ Something analogous might be done for fathers. The latter should have at least a working knowledge of household duties for use in emergency (e.g., childbirth, illness, holidays). Most of this can be acquired by helping mother, in childhood.

are responsible for its present status?" was the next question asked. To this the percentage of replies was:

- Lack of discipline (77 percent)
- Lack of religious training (66 percent)
- Lack of ideals (55 percent)
- Inadequate preparation for home-making (55 percent)

Influences for good, outside the home, were ranked in the following order:

1. School
2. Church
3. Athletics
4. Public entertainments
5. Street companions
6. Newspapers
7. Motor travel

The same influences were ranked as to their bad effect, in the following order:

1. Street companions
2. Newspapers
3. Public entertainment
4. Motor travel
5. Athletics

"Do you consider that the entrance of women into industry has lowered the standards of conduct in the home?" was answered yes by 48 percent, no by 19 percent, while 33 percent failed to answer.

"What, in your opinion, is the most potent single factor responsible for the shortcomings of the present-day American home?" The answers were:

- Lethargy—the "don't care" spirit (53 percent)
- Untrained parenthood (50 percent)
- Economic determinism (12 percent)

As to remedies, 71 percent of the women favored education of children for parenthood and home making in the public schools,

while 42 percent also thought that special classes in child study and parenthood for those already in the home would be of value.

While this inquiry brings to light only the opinions of a single group, it demonstrates clearly that a body of women of superior education and social status sees plainly that the unsatisfactory position of the home is largely due to their own lack of preparation, and that of their husbands, for the responsibilities of home life.

Even the most thorough curriculum of this sort would probably have to omit some matters of fundamental importance, particularly the more intimate and personal aspects of reproduction. Yet the matters thus omitted are in some ways more important than any others, and are at the bottom of most family tragedies, as I have pointed out in the section on Broken Homes. Matters of this sort should be handled by a clinic available for consultation (free, pay, or part pay, according to the case, as with medical clinics), which must be created for this purpose. Such a clinic should contain a group of specialists capable of advising on questions of (1) heredity and eugenics, (2) reproduction, and (3) mental hygiene. Probably such a clinic could be made self-supporting, or nearly so; but its service to the state would be so important that the state could well afford to endow it heavily, if that were necessary. The same clinic might well serve as a referee in cases of broken homes. There is much to be said in favor of a proposal to oblige every person intending to marry to present himself or herself at such a clinic for examination and consultation; not necessarily with a view to prohibiting marriage to certain classes, but with the idea that people who are going to marry should not be allowed to marry in ignorance.

The chief obstacle at present in the way of carrying out such a proposal—apart from the apathy of public opinion—is that there are not enough qualified experts in the country to staff many such clinics. This is a lack that will be remedied in time,—the more so if a public demand for such services should be expressed.

A modest start in the right direction has been made in a number of European cities, as Vienna, Hamburg, Berlin, Milan, and Dresden. The experiment in the last-named city is directed by Ph.

Kuhn, professor in the Hygienic Institute of the Technical High School there, who has furnished me with information about his *Eheberatungsstelle* (Clinic for Advice Regarding Marriage). This is open to all persons, for a small fee; in the case of those who have health insurance, the fee is paid by the insurance bureau. Necessary examinations are made of the individuals (usually married couples) who apply, and their family history is investigated. Up to the present, Dr. Kuhn says that most of the applicants fall into two groups: couples whose conjugal happiness is disturbed by difficulties such as mental maladjustment, homosexuality, venereal diseases, and the like; and a larger number who want to know whether it is desirable for them to have children, in view of certain conditions in the ancestry. He feels that some further public education will be necessary before many Germans realize the desirability of consulting the clinic as a preliminary to marriage.

In connection with the eugenic side of marriage, there is need for some registry of the facts of ancestry, as Francis Galton long ago pointed out. J. H. Kellogg announced the creation of a Eugenics Registry at Battle Creek, Michigan in 1914 but the plans have not been put into effect. William McDougall has recently called attention to the need again. Details are not easy to work out, but it appears feasible to make a start in this direction without great expense. Something might be done through the patriotic societies, which have on file thousands of pedigrees of living persons, and something more might be done by taking advantage of the physical examinations which are made by the hundred thousand through insurance companies, Christian Associations, schools, and colleges. If a few details of ancestry were added to such examinations, and these with some of the principal data, or certain ratings, of the physical examinations, were placed in a public file, it would be possible for a woman to find out something about a man who was becoming attentive to her, and vice versa.

In any event, there should be a thorough, accurate registration of births. In this respect the United States still stands near the bottom of the list of civilized nations, not far from Turkey, China,

and Russia. Registration of finger-prints, or in the case of newborn babies the print of the sole of the foot, should be a part of the record.

In a slightly different direction, there is urgent need of endowment for research on better methods of managing childbirth, and on fertility and sterility. No branch of medical science has lagged so far behind, during the last generation, as has obstetrics, yet it is the branch in which more people are personally interested than in any other. Every discovery which makes childbirth less painful will be of real value to the family. It would seem reasonable to ask that men and money be available for this purpose to at least as great an extent as for cancer research—not to say the research in methods of breeding plants and barnyard animals.

In particular, obstetrics and gynecology need to be developed more fully on the preventive side. While this side is being stressed in other fields of medicine, with extraordinarily successful results, the specialties concerned with childbirth have tended to confine themselves mainly to the treatment of ill effects after they have arisen. The campaign for pre-natal care has for the most part reached women in the lowest economic strata: unquestionably they need it, but it is often no less needed by other women. Little has been done to put into general effect the existing knowledge regarding the proper hygiene of adolescent girls—on the contrary, they have sometimes been encouraged to take up the same field sports that occupy their brothers, although there is now a growing reaction against this. There is room for much research and public education as to biological preparation for parenthood in both sexes.

THE PROMOTION OF MARRIAGE

2. Organization to promote marriage will suggest to most people the Matrimonial Agency with its *Cupid's Guide*, published weekly; or the Lonesome Club which through want ads in the Sunday papers invites all strangers to come out and have an old-fashioned good time. Organizations which have started with the avowed intention of acting as matchmakers have usually been short-lived, due among other things to the inherent bashfulness and coyness

of the human male and female respectively, which make them shrink from being introduced to each other as forlorn-hope candidates for conjugation.

But there is room for effective promotion of marriage on the part of many media which by no means make this their ostensible object. Young people's organizations in all churches, for example, are renowned for match-making, and as I have pointed out previously, marriages originating there are likely to turn out well. Every association which brings together young people of both sexes, of more or less similar tastes and backgrounds, is a potential promoter of marriage.

On the other hand, organizations which take in large numbers of young people of a single sex, and herd them together in monastic segregation, are dangerous. Neither the Young Men's Christian Association nor the Young Women's Christian Association, as at present conducted, is doing its full duty to the community. Each tends to create, in large cities, a celibate community, escape from which becomes increasingly difficult as a member becomes more and more at home in the circle. Eventually these organizations may realize the necessity of joining forces in some form, if they are not to do their clients more harm than good.

THE ORGANIZATION OF HOME WORK

3. Every so often, every popular magazine carries an article describing some new coöperative housekeeping scheme, which will usher in the dawn of a better era by making it possible for people to keep house without having to do any work. All such plans of which I have had any knowledge have been failures. Usually they try to do too much, supplying to their patrons ready-cooked meals, for instance, which can be procured better at a restaurant, and which in any case do not satisfy the ideals of home life that are held by most people.

All such experiments are welcome, however, as paving the way for more successful measures. There are some phases of housekeeping that appear to be suitable subjects for standardization and coöperative effort, without in any way invading the individual-

ity of the home. There are many others that are suitable subjects for systematization, simplification, elimination of waste motion, and the use of labor saving devices. Every improvement in this direction is a gain.

Some writers, going beyond this, have asserted that housework, which they assume to be mere unproductive drudgery, should be done by the organized effort of those unable to do any higher grade of work. Thus it is supposed that a band of able-bodied morons, for instance, might have a route, taking a score of homes in a neighborhood and dealing with each of them in turn, during the day. This score of wives would thereby be freed for other occupations.

Several difficulties appear in all such proposals.

1. They might be available to a limited class of city women, but would hardly reach any country women. The latter, however, are the ones who have the most work to do, whereas many city women have little to do.

2. Such a scheme deprives the children of what is one of their most valuable means of education, namely, helping their parents with the housework. Of course, they might also help the moron, but any parent will see objections to such a plan.

It seems probable that the actual result would be to separate the children from this natural means of contact with the real work of the world, and to turn them over to their mother, or some one else, for artificial training and the instillation of "culture." Under these conditions there would be danger of bringing up a large class of children in a sort of vacuum, and the production of a new group of maladjusted parasites, when society already has far too many such.

One of the triumphs of the Montessori Method was a frame holding two pieces of cloth. One piece had an edge dotted with buttons. The edge opposite was embroidered with buttonholes. The promising pupil was given this frame and allowed to insert the buttons in the holes for that purpose made and provided, thereby acquiring invaluable training in the coördination of eye and hand, not to say initiative, freedom, concentration, joy in creative work, muscular control, and education for the Larger

Problems of Life, and other articles too numerous to mention. It seems never to have occurred to some of the users of this System that the promising pupil might, under certain circumstances, have been able to acquire these same characteristics in his own home by putting on his own clothes and those of his younger brothers and sisters. Similarly one might analyze many other educational efforts, and find that they only attempt to do inefficiently and expensively what the home does naturally and well.

3. It puts a new burden on the already overburdened husband, making his home and children an additional drain on his earning capacity, and thereby tending to discourage him in both respects.

The remedies usually proposed for this are (i) that the wife be paid a salary by the state (endowment of motherhood), or (ii) that she go out of the home and earn money by doing some "higher" type of work.

The first of these proposed remedies would necessitate drastic financial and economic readjustments of the state and it is doubtful whether it could be put into effect at the present time, even if it were desirable,—and, as pointed out in the preceding section, it is undesirable in many ways.

The second involves consideration of the whole subject of woman's work outside the home—a topic far too large to be covered as an incidental here. Yet it is impossible to avoid at least suggesting some of the salient points, as a guide to thought.

A few enthusiasts have suggested that all women be "liberated" to work outside their own homes, their families being cared for by some one else. But as this policy, if widely applied, suggests the conditions on that historic island where all the inhabitants lived by taking in each other's washing, most advocates of women's industrialization have held that women should be trained both for home and for outside work, and should do the latter at periods when they are not called upon to do the former. While it is admitted that woman's primary duty is the care of her own children, it is held that the following classes of women could properly take an active part, outside of their homes, in the routine work of the world:

- (a) The defective woman, who must not bear children.
- (b) The genius, whose talents are so valuable to the world that the loss of her children would not be as great as the loss of her other creative work.
- (c) The girl before marriage.
- (d) The young wife, before the arrival of her first baby.
- (e) The middle aged woman, whose children have grown up and left home.

A brief analysis of each of these cases will serve to bring out the realities.

(a) This is the simplest case of all. The woman with defective heredity, or some other handicap which bars her from normal family life, is unquestionably in a better position to have a career, than is any other, and such work offers the best use of her energies, in most cases.

(b) It can not be admitted, however, that the possession of genius, or what a girl or her friends suppose to be genius, is a justification for the abandonment of motherhood. I have discussed this point in dealing with celibacy (Part II, Section I), and need not repeat here.

(c) Girls who have completed their education and are waiting to marry make up the bulk of the women workers of America. It is generally known that one woman in every four (11 or 12 millions in all) is now gainfully employed outside the home. Most of these are single women (probably not one wife in 15 is gainfully employed outside her home), and four-fifths or more will marry within a few years. Girls at this age offer a problem to their parents in many cases. The great bulk of the industrial processes carried on in the average American home a century ago, or even half a century ago, has gone, never to return. The mothers therefore have less to do than formerly; the daughters, who formerly helped their mothers, have little or nothing to do. They stop school early to seek occupation, and leave the home to go into factories, offices, laundries, restaurants, department stores, and class rooms; expecting to stay only a few years, at most.

It can hardly be said that the influence of this period is favorable

to future family life. Warren S. Thompson has emphasized this point in some detail. The occupations which these girls follow are, for the most part, largely mechanical; they take little interest in them, regarding them as necessary evils to earn money for the family or for luxuries; they intend to marry as soon as possible and therefore have no incentive to develop responsibility or self-reliance. They never learn to regard work as the normal and proper condition of life: rather it represents to them an evil from which they must escape through the door of matrimony. "Such qualities as patience, foresight, economy, good taste, and adaptability—essentials to a happy life under all conditions—are not to be acquired with the taking of marriage vows; they must be developed slowly through the years. . . . The work of these girls not only does little to help them develop such qualities, but often actually aids in developing other traits of character which unfit them for home life, e.g., carelessness, shirking, selfishness, irresponsibility, and vulgarity. The woman who looks upon her daily life in the home as she looked upon her day's work in the factory or store before she was married is certain to find little there which will compensate her for raising a family. When this attitude toward the home exists, when all the good things of life are thought to lie outside the daily routine of home life, family limitation will be practiced if the woman knows how," and the influence of this particular home will not be favorable to any one concerned.

Encouragement of girls' work at this period can, therefore, not be given. A further difficulty is that the most intelligent and efficient girls are the ones most likely to get ahead in their work, and therefore under the most temptation to remain in it permanently, abandoning marriage or motherhood. Yet these are the ones whose motherhood is most desirable. In any event, therefore, girls working at this period of their lives should understand that they are not taken on permanently; and business success is for them not desirable, since it encourages celibacy. Business success for young men, on the contrary, encourages marriage.

(d) The idea that the young wife, before the arrival of her first baby, has a period of leisure when she can profitably work outside

the home, is largely false and harmful. At the beginning, most girls have plenty to do, adjusting themselves to a new status. Any worth-while opportunity for work can be got only through postponement of the first pregnancy, and such postponement for more than a year is harmful, both mentally and physically.

(e) The middle-aged woman whose children have left the parental home is in a more favorable condition to make a contribution outside. Indeed, of the five classes here mentioned, she is the most favorably situated. She has in many cases leisure, experience, and a mature outlook on life that particularly fits her to be useful; and, as suggested earlier, she might well take up a large part of the elementary teaching which is now done by girls in class (c).

If the foregoing considerations are generally well based, one must conclude that there is less opportunity than is sometimes supposed, for an extension of gainful work by women outside the home, if the interests of the latter are to be conserved.

Finally, it must be said in candor that there is a certain amount of mere cant in the plea that women are now slaves to household drudgery. There are many such, but there are also many who have a larger degree of leisure than has ever been possessed by any women in the world, even those in an aristocratic society based on slave labor. When it comes to housekeeping for a family of two in a small apartment, any honest observer must admit that the work is light enough at worst, and that no one except the hopelessly uneducated housewife can complain that she is so held down by her domestic duties that she has no time for self-improvement. And in fact, most of the complaint about domestic slavery, when not the merest stereotyped broadcasting of paid (and unmarried) propagandists, represents only the whine of the inadequate wife who thinks she should have a servant to help her open the packages she brings home from the delicatessen store twice a day.

Much of the complaint is based on conditions that have long since been remedied and are now wholly imaginary. Knitting socks for a husband, or rendering fat to make soap, might now be considered wasteful occupations for most women (desirable as they

may have been in a primitive community); but what woman now does them? But personal care of a home, not only to safeguard the inmates' health, but still more to safeguard the spiritual values—what substitute is available for this?

With due recognition of injustices that have occurred in the past, which are now thoroughly exposed and mostly on the way to correction, is it not time to protest that a good deal of the cut-and-dried agitation against woman's fate in a man-made world has become obsolete and hardly in good taste? It is privately repudiated by a great majority of women, but they do not like to speak out. If the truth must be told, the fact is that most men have to work during nearly all of their lives, and the majority of them work hard, to support a family. The ordinary man does not spend much time bewailing this cross. If he does, he is properly despised. He is not lionized for getting up at a men's club and mourning over the hard lot of his brethren who have to slave all day long at a menial task because baby needs shoes. In some important respects, he has the worst of the bargain, for his work is usually routine drudgery, whereas the work of caring for children, if approached with proper preparation, is the most fascinating work in the world. Although he is largely cut off from this, he recognizes that biological specialization gives him his own part to play. The great majority of inarticulate, civilized women feel instinctively, I think, just as savage women do, that their mission is the greater. Many of the rebels deserve psychoanalysis rather than admiration.

Any improvements in civilization that give women more time to devote to the improvement of themselves and of their husbands and children will be desirable, if the time is used wisely for those purposes. But until the education of women is much improved, such changes should not be made too rapidly. If increased leisure for the married woman merely means that much more time to be killed by inane amusements and competitive extravagance, it will be a great hindrance to the development of wholesome family life. Many ill-educated wives would be better off, and the community would be vastly better off, if they had more drudgery to do than

they now have. The plea of women that they be freed for other occupations will receive more attention when they show their willingness to employ their freedom to better advantage than many of them do now.

The true direction of improvement is not so much along the line of decreasing the mother's personal attention to the home, as of increasing the father's personal attention to it.

Every effort should be made, however, to have homemaking and motherhood put on a sounder basis in public estimation. Certainly the occupation of home maker should be recognized by the Census as on a par with any, and in every other connection where occupation is taken into account, great care should be exercised to see that this one is treated with the dignity and honor to which it is entitled.

FOR MORE CHILDREN

4. Organization to increase directly the reproductivity of superior families might aid such families by rewarding them with money or with honor.

Financial rewards have been discussed in the preceding section. They might take the form of endowment, of state subsidy, of insurance, or several others.

Efforts have been made in France and elsewhere to give particular honors to the parents of large and worthy families. Obviously, this sort of thing must be done subtly, or it may become ludicrous and offensive.

Something might be accomplished to foster the ideals of family life by awarding prizes for works of art—painting, sculpture, drama, and fiction—which were judged to be most successful in holding up high ideals to this end. Any one who takes the trouble to search for conspicuous examples of this sort will be surprised to find how rare they are. If the drama or novel does not end with the betrothal, it commonly finds the misadventures of married life more interesting than the happiness thereof; while pictorial art is still so much under the sway of the Isis-Madonna tradition that fathers get scant recognition.

Pride of ancestry is often a stimulus to reproduction, and the

study of genealogy is valuable for this reason. The numerous patriotic societies all serve a useful purpose, but the most desirable form of pedigree-study is that which has a eugenic basis, and concerns itself specifically with the inherited traits of the ancestors. Edmund Burke remarked that "Those who do not look backward to ancestry will never look forward to posterity." Family tradition has a great value. Permanence is essential to such tradition. One of the strong arguments against broken homes, and against temporary, free love matings, is that they destroy such tradition, or prevent its growth, and thereby deprive the family of one of its best supports. What sense of dignity and civic worth has a sterile free-lover, as compared with the mother or father of a successful family?

The frequent moves of American families into new houses or new localities have also tended to destroy family continuity and thereby hinder family conservation. This incessant moving, which is one of the national characteristics, is due to (a) inherent nomadism, evidenced in the first place by the fact that the ancestors of all white Americans of the present generation left their own homes to come to the New World; and (b) to the great new opportunities for gain, constantly opening up. As the latter diminish with the appropriation of natural resources and the growth of population, the nomadic impulse will get less opportunity for expression.

At the behest of women seeking to get for their sex its full share of control over the home, legislation has been adopted or proposed in a number of countries, which attempts to apportion definitely the family authority. In the patriarchal family the will of the father was obeyed unquestioningly. The movement here discussed proposes to recognize that father and mother have an equal right to control family life, whether it be the discipline of children, the place where the family shall live, or the scale of expenditure.

In principle, this is sound enough, and the principle is followed in most homes, plans being discussed and decisions made jointly. When the two parents differ, a compromise must be reached on some basis, unless one of the two is willing to give in for the sake of harmony.

While there are some families in which the father has undue influence, and probably fully as many in which the mother has undue influence, the system of discussion and compromise seems to about as satisfactory as could well be expected. But it is not satisfactory to the reformers, who ask for laws that will refer parental differences of opinion to the courts, which will then act as arbiter. Various proposals of similar intent will occur to the reader who has followed the course of domestic legislation in recent years. A bill introduced by women deputies in the Austrian parliament (1925) provided that a child might, at the age of 14, petition the court to study for a profession it preferred, if its wishes did not coincide with the plans its parents had made for it.

While the effect of laws of this type can not be determined definitely without experiment, there is every reason to regard them all with distrust. One of the causes of the decline of the birth-rate among superior families is the weakening of the family as an institution, which has resulted from the invasion of its functions by the state. Nothing could be more mischievous in this connection than an invasion of family discipline by the state. Experience indicates that the strong, healthy, self-perpetuating family is the family that has unity, that is an organic whole. The attempt to disrupt it still further by encouraging a 14-year-old boy to appeal to the court, if his parents' plans for his future do not correspond with his own ambition to be a cowboy or a big-league pitcher, will commend itself to few thoughtful students. Self-respecting parents will not run to a justice of the peace and ask him to decide their quarrels over family matters; others should not be encouraged to do so. If parents can not agree privately on what is for the benefit of their children, the interposition of a court is likely to help them little; and it is certain to diminish what little respect the ultra-modern child still retains for parental authority.

FOR FEWER CHILDREN

5. To decrease the reproduction of inferior families, clinics which could teach methods of contraception have been most widely advo-

cated. Every possible use should be made of this means; some of its limitations have been mentioned previously. Since many parents can not be trusted, because of their lack of self-control and foresight, to limit their families voluntarily, the most effective means would be to sterilize one of them by a surgical operation. Such an operation performed on the mother requires the opening of the abdomen, and at once involves expense and danger. Sterilization by X-rays has sometimes been recommended, but has been found so far to be unreliable and dangerous, resulting sometimes not in infertility but in the birth of defective children. An operation on the father would be relatively easy, inexpensive, and without danger, and represents probably the only effective method of birth control for this part of the community. Whether public opinion is yet ready to sanction the widespread, voluntary application of such a measure remains to be seen.

In any case it should be applied, for reasons mentioned in Part II, Section XI, only to parents who are relatively responsible. For the grossly defective and extremely inferior, farm colonies with segregation of the sexes offer more hope of real and immediate accomplishment. These colonies can be made self-supporting or more, if properly planned and managed. They can perform a great deal of useful work for the community and furnish their members with a much happier life than they would ever find if left free to compete with normal people. Some conspicuously successful examples are to be found in New York, New Jersey, and elsewhere.

CARE OF CHILDREN

6. Country children have plenty of room for play, plenty of occupation of the kind that educates, and usually brothers and sisters as associates. If the parents want to go somewhere, the children are left at home safely in the charge of the oldest girl, or else are bundled into the automobile and taken along.

The city child has almost none of these advantages. His playground is the fire escape, the alley, or a little strip of sidewalk; he has nothing to do; usually not enough brothers and sisters to

play with; and he is a constant source of anxiety to his parents. One of the serious drawbacks to this life is that the city child, surrounded by thousands of other children, is in real danger of being brought up without enough normal contacts with suitable children of his own age.

An extension of the system of day nurseries, playgrounds, and kindergartens, is the remedy most often proposed. This, it is said, would give these children the necessary companionship, and would also free their mothers' time to some extent for other occupations, of which every city offers such a tempting array.

Such a solution is probably the only one feasible in certain parts of the city population, but it has serious drawbacks. Reasons have already been given against removing the child too long from its home environment and turning it over to "the whole colorless and indifferent crowd of total strangers and mechanical mercenaries." From a broader point of view, the extension of such facilities must be watched with care, lest it end in being merely another burden on the superior part of the population. If these institutions could be made merely a training school where young women might serve an apprenticeship while preparing for marriage, many of the evils attending them would be eliminated. What more often happens is the establishment of a system that is less admirable. In order that women may leave their children, and go out to work in sweated industries at insufficient wages, there is introduced a complicated system of motherhood endowment, day nurseries, milk depots, crèches, widow's pensions, visiting nurses and social workers, physicians, nurses, and attendants at clinics and in free maternity wards, playground instructors, and the like, each one of whom insensibly comes to have a vested interest in perpetuating the system and, with it, his job. A large part of the employes of this system are superior unmarried women, who find in their employment little stimulus to marriage and little opportunity for marriage. The wage-earning mother whose children actually benefit by these facilities is quite unable to pay her share of the upkeep of all these costly substitutes for her own services, so the burden

too often falls on the much-burdened middle class, already forced to cut down the number of its own children by too many burdens of this sort. Thus, as Mr. and Mrs. Whetham point out, "one of the most vicious circles in modern civilization is formed, and once formed, is regarded as inevitable and desirable, superior girls being at once encouraged to prepare themselves to occupy such positions as a life work, rather than to become mothers."

To break such a vicious circle is not easy, and it can not be done at all without a prolonged effort. Industries which succeed only by the labor of tenement-house mothers will have to find some other source of recruitment. Fewer children among these families, and better education of the mothers in the duties of their proper occupations, will help. Back of everything else is the necessity of a more active and intelligent interest in the conservation of the family from a eugenic point of view.

Housing difficulties are so well recognized as to need nothing more than mention. Parents often have trouble in finding homes where children will be permitted; they have still more in finding homes where children will be well provided for. Although the man putting up a new house often asserts that he is doing so primarily for the benefit of his children, the latter are the last ones who get any real consideration from the architect. There is room here for some radical reforms.

MORE RECREATION

7. Increase in facilities for wholesome, inexpensive recreation, preferably out of doors, for persons of all ages, is an important part of the conservation of the family. For children, playgrounds, school grounds, parks, swimming pools, and properly supervised commercial amusements are needed in greater abundance. For adults, there are such possibilities as community centers, gymnasia, swimming pools, commercial entertainments, public lectures, concerts, motion pictures, dances, and so on in innumerable array. This is such a specialized and highly developed field that further discussion here would be out of place.

ELIMINATION OF EVILS

8. Almost every form of social organization ought to contribute either directly or indirectly to the conservation of the family, both constructively, and by aiding to eliminate the many perils which the family has to face. Churches, and men's and women's clubs, have a particularly important part to play, but they rarely live up to their responsibilities.

Beyond this it has been found, in any city where conditions become flagrant, that the formation of a small group to stimulate law enforcement has been extremely helpful. I have described the operation of such a committee somewhat fully in an earlier publication (1919).

Attention should be centered on preventive and protective work, particularly to stop the exploitation of the young by commercial agencies of a vicious sort. Policewomen and women protective workers have been found valuable in many communities. But throughout it must be remembered that the constructive work is the most effective; that no child is ever so safe as when he is in the right kind of a home; and that most juvenile delinquents come from broken homes.

The failure of parents of this generation to exercise an adequate supervision over their children, or to develop a feeling of comradeship in the home, has been pointed out so often that it is painfully trite: but it is none the less important.

Commercial dance halls are difficult of regulation, and likely to be trouble-breeders. Many attempts have been made to find a successful formula for dealing with them, but results have rarely if ever been wholly satisfactory, so far as I am aware.

Censorship of motion pictures, the stage, and fiction is a much discussed theme, into the details of which it is impossible here to enter. That some sort of censorship is fully justified was pointed out in the introduction to this part. Official censorship of motion pictures seems to have done more good than harm, except to the sensibilities of a few Personal Liberty crusaders, and to the pocket-books of a few pandering exhibitors. A jury of 12 representative

men and women has been tried in New York City to deal with the legitimate stage (often falsely so called), while a committee, organized in Massachusetts to rule on printed matter, has given satisfaction. On general principles, much is to be said for the plea that censorship in each field of art should be left to the action of the best men and women in that particular field; but they must have power to enforce their decisions.

Under any effective system of censorship it is inevitable that some good work will be stopped, but this will be more than compensated for by the bad work eliminated. The fact is that much of the flood of fiction and drama would be well spared. It is not the function of art to solve sociological problems. Obviously, most artists are wholly unequipped for such a task. One of the worst features of modern civilization (due largely to an educational system based on authority instead of on open mind) is the excessive respect it shows for printed matter—outdoing even the Chinese veneration for anything that gets put in ink on paper. Any worn-out old roué or hysterical young girl can project his or her libido—as Dr. Freud would say—over 300 pages of manuscript, get the result bound between covers, and at once it becomes Art with capital A. If it be obscure, incoherent, unintelligible, so much the better: it is then Deep (cf. the skatophilous babble of James Joyce). It is high time that some of the flood of modern literature were diverted into an outfall sewer, and if official censorship is the only method to bring this about, then official censorship will have to come.

Few fathers would deliberately give their own children pornographic literature to read. Much of the adult population of the United States consists of those who are mentally children but—worse still—with the physical feelings of a grown-up. Bad literature does them more harm than it would a grammar-school child; yet any attempt to stop the stream rouses the frenzied opposition of the self-appointed Guardians of Art.

Art should confine its attentions to its proper function. Whatever that may be, it is certainly not the reconstruction of the mores. It should leave to science the task of studying and modifying where

necessary the social structure of society. If artists are to undertake the latter task, they must inevitably be judged on the basis of their own personalities, as well as on the basis of their artistry—a proposition that is peculiarly infuriating to devotees of Art for Art's Sake. Most professional critics of art and literature would then have to have a wholly different background from that which they now possess. The excitement aroused among the literati not long ago when Margaret Deland gave utterance to the truism that fiction must be based on truth, is amusing evidence, if any were needed, of the extent to which this truism is ignored, both in the theory and in the practice of many modern writers.

Legislation, and its enforcement, are needed in connection with many phases of the conservation of the family; but as the laws in question have been discussed at appropriate places in the body of this book, they will not be reviewed here. Laws offer no panacea, no short cut to reform, and it is more important just now that public opinion be formed intelligently on all problems concerning the family, than it is to pass many new laws. A better society will come not so much from new legislation as from better people—better by birth, or better by education, or (more usually) both.

PART IV
CONCLUSION

THE CHANGING FAMILY

The monogamous family is an institution which has evolved along with the human race, and has been one of the things that has raised mankind above the ape. It is based on the most fundamental instincts and biological necessities, and because of these facts there is no reason to suppose that it will be outgrown within any period that can now be foreseen.

During the last century or two, however, it has been going through a transition period. The old system of guidance by religion and custom has to a large extent broken down, without the development as yet of a rational guidance to take its place.¹ Many men and women are therefore drifting helplessly, swept this way and that by contradictory feelings and dispositions and habits.

This condition has been worsened by many others that are matters of common knowledge. The average level of intelligence in the United States has probably decreased, through birth limitation of the older stocks and immigration of millions of foreigners. The latter have brought their own customs and institutions, which did not always harmonize with those of America. Great material prosperity has prevailed, and has inevitably tended to make its benefits overvalued, so that to many persons the pleasures to be had in a home have seemed small when contrasted with those open "down town" to the possessor of a pocket full of spending money. The crowding of people into large cities has crippled normal home life, and made it non-existent for many; this city life has also thrown on the schools a burden which they are unable to bear. The great multiplication of interests outside the home has tended still further to draw young and old away from the traditional fireside; and the perfection of means of transportation, particularly the automobile, has contributed immensely to this end. The low tone of literature and the drama; the effects of the World War;

¹ I have discussed this point more fully in a separate publication (1922).

the general dependence on immature girls as school teachers; the increasing absorption of women in affairs outside the home and the participation by many of them in business and industry—all these and a score of other causes familiar to every reader have changed completely, in a large proportion of cases, the inner character of the family.

While many of these changes were unavoidable, and many of them in other respects desirable, they should have been recognized as altering the character of the family, and education for family life should have been brought up to date so that, as each new problem arose, young people would be trained to meet it.

This, however, was not done. On the contrary, as the problems confronting husband and wife increased in complexity, the education available to help them meet these problems seemed to become less and less adequate. The result is that there is now a much greater gap than there was a hundred years ago, between the duties of parents and their capacity to discharge these duties.

A century ago, for instance, the selection of a mate was a simple matter,—young people grew up together in the same village, went to school, church, and parties together, knew each other thoroughly, fell in love, and settled down to home making in the same community, with a common background and among friends and relatives to help them. The family physician advised them regarding matrimony. The neighbors gave them “showers” and sometimes even helped to build them a house. There were abundant sisters, mothers, aunts, and grandmothers, to assist a young girl with her babies. The standard of living was simple in most communities; the girls did not expect silk stockings any more than the boys expected automobiles. In life on a farm or in a village, children could give enough help to their parents, after a few years, to be an aid rather than a burden and—much more important—by giving this help they prepared themselves to become successful parents and citizens in later years.

Now, boys and girls are often set adrift in a large city, without any facilities for meeting possible mates. If they do meet, it is an

accident, and matings are likely to be between persons who know nothing of each other's pasts, and whose backgrounds are in many ways dissimilar. They settle down among strangers, in an unfriendly environment where not a hand is reached out to guide and steady them, while all around are difficulties, distractions, and seductions which make it as easy as possible for the home to be wrecked. Bearing and bringing up children involves another group of difficulties, equally appalling to a friendless couple, fighting for existence in a hostile city with no training to solve much easier problems than those they actually have to face.

Present-day civilization is the first one on record to place the entire responsibility for success in managing a family, on two persons only. In the past, even in America, the burden has been more divided, as outlined above, while in other civilizations, of which the Chinese is an outstanding illustration, the load has been so widely distributed that the welfare of an individual is a matter of concern, and even of active interference, to every one of his kinsmen.

For many reasons, it appears that some form of distribution of the burden is the more rational procedure. It will be interesting to see how the American family develops, in this respect, during the next few generations. The recent tendency has been to take responsibility from relatives and transfer it to the state. This is not working well, and probably, in the nature of things, never will work well. It seems likely that there will be a swing back in the other direction, to emphasize once more the solidarity and continuity of family life.

In addition to the obstacles that have been mentioned, one might enumerate many abnormalities, some of which have been exploited by highly commercialized methods. With all these handicaps, it is remarkable that the wreckage of families is as small as it is.

It is bad enough, however, to make many superficial observers think it is worse and give it up as hopeless. This is the type of reformer who sets the house on fire to get rid of the rats. Un-

fortunately his name is still Legion—or, more frequently, her name is Legion, for the multiplication of reckless bachelor girls, parasite wives, cynical divorcees, and vindictive old maids has created a large class of malcontents who would justify their own inadequacy by blaming everything—except themselves. Added to these are similar classes of men, together with many earnest, well-meaning, but ignorant persons of both sexes who seek only the betterment of mankind, but are groping for it in complete mental darkness.

As all these classes enjoy nothing more than to preach their views and thereby exalt themselves; and as the people who are happily married are too busy enjoying each other and their children to descend into the arena and contend with these sociological gladiators, the prophets of calamity have had things too much their own way. The result of half a century or more of this is that even the innocent spectator is beginning to think that the family is a lost cause, and that the wisest course might be that which rats are popularly supposed to adopt on a sinking ship,—to desert it and seek safety elsewhere.

Here, it seems to me, is the greatest danger in the present situation. Confused by the propaganda I have mentioned, people who ought to know better are likely to jump to the conclusion that, because the family is out of joint, this disjointed condition must be dealt with as a final reality, and all social measures shaped to suit the supposed reality. In other words, it is the old story of not seeing beyond the symptoms, and puttering around with these when one should be going to the root of the evil and eradicating it.

This is precisely what has once happened with prostitution. It existed, therefore it was supposed to be a "necessary evil," and well-meaning people consented to perpetuate and worsen it by establishing segregated districts, with state license, regulation, and supervision. There always had been prostitution, it was argued; man's nature seemed to demand it; therefore, though it might have some unpleasant aspects, realists could do nothing except face the reality and make the best of it; which they supposed they were doing, while W. E. H. Lecky, like a film hero, shed the

official glycerine tears² over the sad fate of this "eternal priestess of humanity," and the pimps, panders, procurers, madames, and crooked politicians chortled with glee while they counted up their profits and swelled the chorus of assurance that human nature was unchangeable and that this was the only way to protect the homes of decent people.

This particular folly has been largely annihilated. At present it would be difficult to find in the United States an informed person who does not recognize that this was an entirely false line of procedure, and that the only scientific course is to refuse all compromise with this wholly unnecessary evil, and to attack it root and branch—especially root.

But society is now starting on the same erroneous course in connection with other unnecessary evils. Sexual promiscuity exists; it seems to meet a demand of man's nature; the freedom of the personality requires that people be as promiscuous as they please; therefore educators in high positions seriously argue that this evil should be legalized and regulated, as prostitution was in the old days of the Red Light District. It seems never to occur to these myopic invalids that the cure lies in prevention, rather than in a patent-medicine cure-all.

I have dealt with this particular proposal elsewhere (1925); but the same argument crops up at every turn. Abortion exists, it is now discovered; it seems to meet a demand of woman's nature; therefore, though it may have some unpleasant aspects, the only thing for realists to do is to look it in the face, legalize it, and readjust society to it.

² The notorious description of the prostitute in his *History of European Morals* deserves frequent repetition as an example of how not to approach a biological problem. Every sentence in it is as mischievously inaccurate as it could be:

"The supreme type of vice, she is ultimately the most efficient guardian of virtue. But for her, the unchallenged purity of countless happy homes would be polluted, and not a few who, in the pride of their untempted chastity, think of her with an indignant shudder, would have known the agony of remorse and despair. On that one degraded and ignoble form are concentrated the passions that might have filled the world with shame. She remains, while creeds and civilizations rise and fall, the eternal priestess of humanity, blasted for the sins of the people."

Mismating and broken homes exist; they seem to correspond to a demand of men's and women's natures; therefore the only thing for practical people to do is to accept them as part of "God's will," to bring them under legal supervision, and to make them easier by regulation.

Each of these propositions is defended, not in so many words, but in a great many more words to the same effect, by innumerable recent writers, who have entirely lost their perspective. It is significant that among them one finds few biologists. From Charles Darwin down, most of the members of this profession have had an evolutionary outlook which has kept them from falling into the errors made by intellectual Don Quixotes.

The fundamental evil, in connection with the family, is mismating; but for every proposal to improve the mating system there are twenty proposals having to do with its consequences and attempting to patch up the results of mismating without even looking at the causes. It seems self-evident that reform should begin by the exhaustion of every endeavor to increase the proportion of successful matings. This would mean (1) better choice in marriage selection, (2) more deliberate and carefully considered marriages, (3) education of parents for their duties, (4) education of both sexes in the art of love, (5) making it possible for people to have children (an essential of a happy marriage for normal people) by removing any obstacles that now hinder this.

Most of the dissatisfaction with existing marriage is expressed either by women, or by men who have accepted the woman's point of view of the case. This point of view is that marriage as it is supposed to exist at present is not favorable to the full development of woman's personality; that it makes of her "the most important domesticated animal" but not a person living every phase of life to the fullest and developing every potentiality of inheritance to the utmost; not a citizen taking an active and constructive part in the affairs of business and government. All these things it is argued, are her natural right, and she must not be asked to give them up and spend her life bearing and rearing children for the benefit of a society which not only does not esteem such a sacrifice

enough to reward it, but rather sneers at anyone who is weak or stupid enough to be caught in the snare.

Such an indictment can not be answered adequately in a sentence, for it is compounded of truth, half-truth, and falsehood, tangled into such a snarl that one scarcely knows where to begin to unravel it. That there are faults in modern marriage is manifest; that they are to be charged against both sexes will be admitted by all fair-minded people; that they are to be removed mainly by education seems clear enough. Every effort should be made to conform to every legitimate desire of women in this respect, if the long domination of man over marriage laws has resulted in injustice; but so far as laws are concerned, everyone knows that the inequalities have been removed with a vengeance, until now the man rather than the woman has a right to complain of mistreatment—a right, it may be noted, which he seems not to value highly, for he rarely avails himself of it. Much of the remaining discontent among women is based on wholly false ideas of the differentiation of the two sexes, and a colossal ignorance of the consequences of the specialization which both have undergone for millions of years. Only a sound biological education will show the way around these quicksands of dissatisfaction.

While the times occasionally look dark, to one who desires the conservation of the family, it must yet be borne in mind that monogamy has weathered many worse storms than this in the past. Like everything else, it has had its advances and its reverses, but this pendular movement seems to bring it steadily, even though slowly, forward.

Lax as are the manners of some parts of society at present, they are not so lax as those that prevailed at one time or another in almost every European nation, including those of antiquity. In Greece and Rome, it is true, the state failed to survive, but went down to ruin when its foundation, the family, decayed. But France and England, Italy and Germany, to name only a few examples, have all passed through much worse crises in family life than they are now undergoing.

It is encouraging to count up the gains, or partial gains.

Woman has been effectively "emancipated." It is too much to expect that she would always use her freedom wisely. Yet it is freedom, and may be made into a gain for all concerned.

A democratic relationship in the family has been reached in theory, and often in practice. Certainly under the worst tyranny to which feminists today can point, there is nothing comparable with the patriarchal power which the father of the family possessed in early Rome.

There is a general, sometimes an excessive, recognition of the rights of the child; but in any case it means progress in the right direction.

A new conception of fatherhood is gaining ground. While this is not perhaps superior to one that has been held by many earlier peoples, it is yet a great improvement on anything that has been generally accepted during the last few centuries in western civilization.

The importance of heredity and eugenics is coming to be recognized as rarely before, and great progress is to be expected in this direction.

The whole subject of reproduction has been pried loose from the tabus under which it lay festering for centuries. This change has been accompanied by temporary excesses, but they can scarcely be said to outweigh the great gain of bringing reproduction into the open and recognizing it as a normal, reputable thing which can even be mentioned aloud among respectable people.

Voluntary parenthood has been accepted in principle, and largely in practice, in almost every part of the civilized world. While this change has, on the whole, proved highly detrimental in operation, the principle is yet an indispensable one to racial progress. It is in line with evolution, which consists, among other things, in a progressive increase of independence, of control exerted by organisms over their environment. With proper emphasis voluntary parenthood can yet become to the race what it already is to the individual—a benefit more than a detriment. Unfortunately, it is not yet clear whether the necessary change in emphasis can be made before irreparable damage is done. This problem of a wise

distribution of birth limitation is the most serious one that society now has to face.

Commercialized and state regulated vice have seen their day. Churches no longer establish segregated districts; bishops no longer figure as owners of bawdy houses; municipalities no longer think they are honoring a guest of the city by presenting him with the freedom of their brothels. Where law enforcement has been tried intelligently, it has succeeded. There has probably never been in history a large city so free from open prostitution as is New York City today—to mention only one conspicuous instance.

The double standard of morality, which accorded license to men while maintaining the "virtue" of women with fanatical jealousy, has lost what little pseudo-scientific support it ever had, and is no longer defended among intelligent people.

Finally, the family has become the subject of rational and active inquiry. While this inquiry has too often ignored the biological premises, and has therefore gone disastrously astray, it is yet an advantage to have any inquiry, for only through free and careful investigation can the complexities of modern life be so adjusted as to safeguard the home.

There is evidence on all sides that a new interest in family conservation is arising. The Family Wage idea, which has spread so extraordinarily in Europe, is an eloquent testimonial to the recognition of the value of the home. More and more, thoughtful people are realizing that it is not necessary to wait for the creation of a Utopia—that a good family life can be maintained here and now, if the available knowledge is put to use.

The marriage of the future—if a slight glance ahead is permissible—will naturally be an improvement on that of the present or past. This evolution, however, will not involve any radical new departures of a legal or economic nature, much less an era of kaleidoscopic "free love." It seems certain that monogamy will be more firmly established than ever before, and that such changes as occur will be largely changes in spirit and attitude. The family of the future will, I think, be marked by (1) much better mate selection, (2) much greater understanding, making for permanence

of love, (3) more intelligent consideration of children, (4) greater concern for individual development, particularly of women, (5) more democracy, (6) fuller biological differentiation of function. In the past, men and women, as complementary and mutually dependent sexes, coöperated in production. The tendency since the beginning of the industrial revolution has been to break up this coöperation in production, and to substitute for it competition in distribution. A better appreciation of the biological foundations of society, with which economics like all other sciences must ultimately be squared, will bring about a return to coöperation between the sexes, not alone for individual gain but even more for the benefit of their children.

In short, the improvement that one may hope to see in monogamy will not be so much an improvement in the forms and conventions (which, after all, are superficial matters), as an improvement in the quality of the people practicing monogamy. Finer and deeper natures form more lasting and helpful bonds with each other than do the frivolous and infantile. Evolution can not continue without producing a better race of men; and a better race of men can not fail to make better marriages.

Progress of mankind as a whole appears to be inevitable if the species survives at all. Progress of any given group is by no means inevitable. History is largely made up of a record of those groups that, through their own ignorance and folly, have been pushed out of the procession. But mankind today has it more nearly in its power than ever before, to make sure of its continued progress. It possesses knowledge that was not available to any nation of the past.

America can go ahead, if it has the will. Wisdom, patience, determination—these with the development of the biological sciences and the coördination of other sciences with them, can not fail to succeed in rendering justice to the individual man and woman, to their children, and to the greater world outside their home. A real effort is necessary, but a real effort will not be in vain.

REFERENCES

- ACHILLES, PAUL S.—*The Effectiveness of Certain Social Hygiene Literature*; New York, 1923.
- BALL, JAU DON and HAYWARD G. THOMAS—"A Sociological, Neurological, Serological, and Psychiatric Study of a Group of Prostitutes"; *American Journal of Insanity*, April, 1918.
- BIGELOW, M. A.—*Sex Education*; New York, 1916.
- BOSANQUET, HELEN—*The Family*; London and New York, 1906.
- BOWLEY, A. L.—"Births and Population in Great Britain"; *Economic Journal*, June, 1924.
- CATTELL, J. McKEEN—*American Men of Science*; New York, 1921.
- CHILDREN'S BUREAU—*Standards of Legal Protection for Children Born out of Wedlock*; Pub. No. 77, Washington, 1921.
- COOPER, JOHN M.—"Human Welfare and the Monogamous Ideal," *Social Hygiene*, October, 1920.
- CRUM, FREDERICK S.—"The Decadence of the Native American Stock," *Quarterly Publications of the American Statistical Association*, September, 1914.
- DAVENPORT, CHARLES B.—"Influence of the Male on the Production of Twins"; *American Naturalist* LIV (1920), 122-129.
- DAVIS, KATHERINE BEMENT—"A Study of the Sex Life of the Normal Married Woman"; *Journal of Social Hygiene*, April, 1922, January, 1923, March, 1923.
- DICKINSON, ROBERT L.—"Contraception: a Medical Review of the Situation"; *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, November, 1924.
- DOUGLAS, PAUL H.—"Is the Family of Five Typical?"; *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, September, 1924.
- ESTABROOK, A. H.—*The Jukes in 1915*; Washington, 1916.
- FOERSTER, FR. W.—*Marriage and the Sex Problem*; New York (1913 ?); (a translation of his *Sexualethik und Sexualpädagogik*, by Meyrick Booth.)
- FRANKENTHAL, KÄTE—"Zur Frage der Strafflosigkeit der Abtreibung"; *Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft*, April, 1921.
- FREUND, ERNST—*Illegitimacy Laws of the United States—Analysis and Index*; U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 42, Washington, 1919.
- GALLOWAY, THOMAS W.—*Love and Marriage*; New York, 1924.
- GALTON, FRANCIS—[Proposal of a Eugenics Registry]; *Fraser's Magazine*, January, 1873.
- GOODSELL, WILLYSTINE—*The Family as a Social and Educational Institution*; New York, 1915.

- HADFIELD, J. A.—*Psychology and Morals*; New York, 1924.
- HALL, FRED S. and MARY E. RICHMOND.—*Child Marriages in the United States*; New York (Russell Sage Foundation), 1925.
- HALVERSON, J. JEANNETTE—"The Profligacy of Dependent Families"; *American Journal of Sociology*, November, 1923.
- HARRIS, JOHN W.—"Pregnancy and Labor in Young Primiparae"; *Bulletin of Johns Hopkins Hospital*, January, 1922.
- HARRISON, PAUL W.—*The Arab at Home*; New York, 1924.
- HILL, JOSEPH A.—"Comparative Fecundity of Women of Native and Foreign Parentage"; *Quarterly Publications of the American Statistical Association* XIII, 583-604.
- HILL, LEONARD—in *The Control of Parenthood* (edited by James Marchant); New York and London, 1920.
- HOLMES, S. J.—"The Size of College Families"; *Journal of Heredity*, October, 1924.
- HOLMES, S. J. and C. M. DOUD—"The Approaching Extinction of the Mayflower Descendants"; *Journal of Heredity* IX (1918), 296-300.
- HOUSSAY, FRÉDÉRIC—"Eugénique et Régimes Alimentaires", in *Eugénique et Sélection*; Paris, 1922.
- HOWARD, GEORGE ELLIOTT—*History of Matrimonial Institutions*; Chicago, 1904.
- JOHNSON, BASCOM—"Law Enforcement in Social Hygiene", in *Sex and Social Health*; American Social Hygiene Association, New York, 1924.
- JOHNSON, ROSWELL HILL—"Eugenic Aspect of Sexual Immorality"; *Journal of Heredity*, March, 1917.
- and PAUL POPENOE—*Applied Eugenics*; New York, 1918.
- "The Determination of Disputed Parentage as a Factor in Reducing Infant Mortality"; *Journal of Heredity*, March, 1919.
- "The Distribution of Wealth as a Eugenist Sees It"; *Social Hygiene*, July, 1921.
- KELLOGG, JOHN HARVEY—"A Eugenics Registry"; in *Proceedings of The First National Conference on Race Betterment*, Battle Creek, 1914.
- KOEGEL, OTTO E.—"Common Law Marriage and its Development in the United States"; in *Eugenics in Race and State*, Baltimore, 1923.
- LEA, HENRY C.—*An Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church*; Boston, 1884.
- LECKY, W. E. H.—*History of European Morals*; New York, 1877.
- LENROOT, KATHARINE F.—"Social Responsibility for the Protection of Children Handicapped by Illegitimate Birth"; *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, November, 1921.
- LENZ, FRITZ—*Menschliche Auslese und Rassenhygiene* (Vol. II of *Grundriss der menschlichen Erblichkeitslehre*, by E. Baur, E. Fischer, and F. Lenz); Munich, 1923.
- LETOURNEAU, CH.—*The Evolution of Marriage and the Family*; London, 1908.

- LUNDBERG, EMMA O. and KATHARINE F. LENROOT—*Illegitimacy as a Child-Welfare Problem, Part II*; U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 75, Washington, 1921.
- MAYNARD, G. D.—"A Study in Human Fertility"; *Biometrika*, March, 1923.
- MCDUGALL, WILLIAM—*Is America Safe for Democracy?*; New York, 1921.
- MEYER, A. W.—"Some Aspects of Abortion"; *Contributions to Embryology* (Carnegie Institute of Washington, Publication No. 275), Washington, 1921.
- MILL, JOHN STUART—*On Liberty*; London, 1859.
- MUDGETT, MILDRED D.—"Where Courts Interlock"; *The Family*, May, 1923.
- NOYES, HILDA H.—"Insurance and Eugenics"; *Eugenical News*, August, 1919.
- "The Development of Useful Citizenship"; *Journal of Heredity*, February, 1920.
- O'SHEA, M. V.—"Changing Courses of Study", in *The Child, His Nature and Needs* (M. V. O'Shea, ed); Valparaiso, Ind., 1924.
- PARKER, CORNELIA STRATTON—*An American Idyl*; Boston, 1919.
- PARKES, A. S.—"Studies on the Sex-Ratio and Related Phenomena: 6, The Effect of Polygyny"; *Annals of Applied Biology*, May, 1925.
- PECK, M. W. and F. L. WELLS—"On the Psycho-Sexuality of College Graduate Men"; *Mental Hygiene*, October, 1923.
- "Further Studies in the Psycho-Sexuality of College Graduate Men"; *ibid.*, July, 1925.
- PHILBY, H. ST. J. B.—*The Heart of Arabia*; New York, 1923.
- POPENOE, PAUL—"Eugenics and College Education"; *School and Society*, October 13, 1917.
- "Will Morality Disappear?"; *Journal of Heredity*, October, 1918.
- and ROSWELL HILL JOHNSON—*Applied Eugenics*; New York, 1918.
- "Law Enforcement: a Plan for Organized Action"; *Social Hygiene*, July, 1919. (Also reprinted as Publication No. 182 of the American Social Hygiene Association.)
- "Eugenics and Human Morality"; *Journal of Heredity*, February, 1922.
- "Eugenics and Islam," in *Eugenics in Race and State*, Baltimore, 1923.
- "Family or Companionship?"; *Journal of Social Hygiene*, March, 1925.
- RAGEOT, GASTON—*La Natalité—ses Lois Economiques et Psychologiques*; Paris, 1918.
- REUTER, E. B.—*Population Problems*; Philadelphia, 1923.
- ROBINSON, WILLIAM J.—"Abortion Historically and Ethnologically Considered"; *American Journal of Urology and Sexology*, 1919.
- SOROKIN, PITRIM—"American Millionaires and Multimillionaires: a Comparative Statistical Study"; *Journal of Social Forces*, III, 627-641.
- SPENCER, ANNA GARLIN—"The Social Education of Women"; *Publications of the American Sociological Society XIII* (1918).
- SPENCER, HERBERT—*Education*; London, 1861.

- SPINNER, J. R.—“Über die Methodik in der Betrachtung des Abortusproblems”; *Archiv für Frauenkunde*, October, 1920.
- STATE CHARITIES AID ASSOCIATION (NEW YORK)—*How Foster Children Turn Out*; Publication No. 165, New York, 1924.
- SWINBURNE, J.—*Population and the Social Problem*; New York, 1924.
- THOMPSON, WARREN S.—“Race Suicide in the United States”; *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, III (1920), 97–146.
- TISSIER, L.—[Report on Abortion]; *Journal de Médecine et de Chirurgie Pratiques*, Sept. 25, 1917.
- TREADWAY, WALTER L., L. O. WELDON and ALICE M. HILL—“Psychiatric Studies of Delinquent Women”; *Public Health Reports*, May, June, and July, 1920.
- TRIDON, ANDRÉ—“Birth Control and Psychoanalysis”; in *Birth Control: What It Is, How It Works, What It Will Do* (Proceedings of the First American Birth Control Conference); pub. by *Birth Control Review*, New York, n.d.
- WAGGAMAN, MARY T.—“Some Developments in the Movement for ‘Family Wages’”; *Monthly Labor Review*, October, 1921.
- WELLS, H. G.—*First and Last Things*; New York (1908?).
- WESTERMARCK, EDWARD—*A History of Human Marriage*, 5th ed.; New York, 1923.
- WHETHAM, W. C. D. and C. D.—*Heredity and Society*; London, 1912.
- YERKES, ROBERT M.—*Psychological Examining in the U. S. Army*; Memoirs of the National Academy of Science XV, Washington, 1921.
- *Intellectual and Educational Status of the Medical Profession as Represented in the U. S. Army*; Bulletin No. 8, National Research Council; Washington, 1921.

INDEX

A

- Abortion and free love, 14, 15
 - attitude of society toward, 249
 - discussion of, 113
 - in Birth Control propaganda, 119
- Abrams, Electronic Reactions of, 145
- Achilles, Paul S., 60, 255
- Age at marriage a cause of unhappiness, 69
 - at marriage in United States, 68
 - in childbirth, 25
 - in marriage, 23, 28
 - relation to sexual activity, 77
 - restrictions on, 28
- Alcoholism as ground for divorce, 82
- American Social Hygiene Association, vii, 88
- Ancestry, importance of good, 27
 - pride in, 235
- Anthropoid apes, type of family among, 9
- Arabian Nights, love in, 75
- Arabs, polygamy among, 17
- Art and family ideals, 234
 - function of, 241
 - relation to morality, 200
- Ascetic ideal, discussion of, 48
- Asylums, orphan, 42
- Athletes, asceticism among, 50
- Authority, family, 235
 - in educational system, 241
- Auto-erotism in marriage, 78

B

- Baby bounties, 210, 212
- Bacon, Francis, 161
- Baker, O. E., 137

- Ball, Jau Don, 85, 255
- Banns, publication of, 33
- Barbary Coast, 84, 85
- Barrenness due to gonorrhea, 93, 96
 - general causes of, 95
- Bastard, 106
- Bastardy, 100
- Beauharnais, Josephine, 97
- Belief, influence of, 159
- Bigelow, M. A., vii, 169, 255
- Birds, life-long monogamy among, 10
- Birth Control and abortion, 119
 - discussion of, 139, 252
- Birth-rate, 21
 - among the inferior, 137
 - among the superior, 127
 - and income, 206
- Births, registration of, 225
- Blue Bird, The*, 188
- Bonaparte, Napoleon, 97, 106
- Bosanquet, Helen, 43, 255
- Bowley, A. L., 143, 255
- Breach of promise, 62, 100
- Bureau of Census, 129
- Burke, Edmund, 235

C

- Carnegie, Andrew, 215
- Carnivora, mating among, 10
- Cattell, J. McKeen, 131, 255
- Celibacy and genius, 230
 - discussion of, 48
 - of college graduates, 131
 - religious, 49
- Celibates, mental attitude of, 54, 170
- Censorship, desirability of, 160
 - place of, 240

- Census Bureau, United States, statistics of, 73
 Chicago Vice Commission, 84
 Childbearing, attitude toward, 197
 Childbirth, danger in, due to age, 69
 need for research on, 226
 Childless family, 35, 95
 Children, care of, 237
 number of, in family, 6, 35
 quality of, 37
 resulting from free love matings, 15
 rights of, 252
 supervision of, 240
 training in sex for, 166
 Children's Bureau, 105, 106, 205, 255
 Chinese form of family, 247
 Christianity and abortion, 113
 celibacy, 50
 Child murder, 121
 Civilization, influence of, on monogamy, 10
 relationship to race, 53
 Clark, Mary A., vii
 Clinics for broken homes, 81
 contraception, 147
 family problems, 81, 224
 treatment of impotence, 83
 Club women's attitude toward home, 222
 Coitus, children's knowledge of, 171
 place of, in life, 66
 teaching of fact of, 170
 Coleridge, S. T., 77
 College graduates, fecundity of, 129
 Colleges, influence of women's, 16
 neglect of education for family life by, 178
 Common law marriage, 33
 Compatibility and broken homes, 80
 and sexual selection, 23
 physical, in marriage, 14
 Complex, parental, among children, 42
 Confucius, 201
 Consanguinity in marriage, 29
 Continence, amount of, among men, 60
 amount of, among women, 61
 Contraceptives, efficacy of, 131
 Cooper, John M., vii, 10, 255
 Court of Domestic Relations, 82, 109
 Cousin marriages, 29
 among Muslims, 19
 Cruelty as ground for divorce, 82
 Crum, Frederick S., 95, 255
- D
- Dance halls, regulation of, 240
 Dancing, 191
 Darwin, Charles, 250
 Davenport, C. B., 97, 255
 Davis, Katherine Bement, 61, 115, 131, 255
 Deer, mating among, 10
 Defectives, fecundity of, 137
 segregation of, 138, 237
 sterilization of, 139, 237
 taxation of, 217
 Defects, mental, in marriage, 30
 Deland, Margaret, 242
 Delayed marriage, 130
 effect on birth rate, 130
 evils of, 63, 68
 Development (physical, mental, reproductive), completion of, 24
 Dickinson, Robert L., 151, 255
 Differentiation, sex, 187, 254
 Diseases, infectious, as bar to marriage, 31
 venereal, 91
 Divorce, discussion of, 72
 in relation to second marriage, 14
 Domestic relations court, 82, 109
 Double standard of morality, 61, 253
 Doud, C. M., 143, 256

Douglas, Paul H., 209, 255
 Dowry, custom of, 70
 Dublin, Louis I., vii
 Dumas, Alexander, Jr., 77

E

Early marriage, advantages of, 25
 Education and sexual selection, 23
 for family life, 221
 relation of birth-rate to, 135
 Egypt, polygamy in, 19
 Employment, preferential, 212
 Emotional attitudes of children, 41,
 167
 of parents, 44
 Emotions, development of, 191
 education of the, 192
 evolution of the, 77
 Endowment of motherhood, 213
 England, fecundity of young wives
 in, 24
 population problem in, 142
 Epilepsy as bar to marriage, 31
 Essenes, tenets of, 49
 Estabrook, A. H., 137, 255
 Esthetic causes of prostitution, 86
 Eugenic considerations in sexual
 selection, 26
 phases of incontinence, 58
 results of venereal diseases, 93
 status of illegitimacy, 104
 Europe, incontinence in, 60
 Everett, Ray H., vii
 Exner, M. J., vii
 Experience, necessity of, before
 marriage, 14
 results of, before marriage, 57,
 59, 63

F

Family as foundation of society, 8
 changing status of, 245

definition of normal, 6
 education shaped toward, 180
 evolutionary view of, 4
 influence of, on children, 41
 influence of, on fathers, 39
 influence of, on mothers, 40
 origin of, 35
 wage, 209, 253
 Farm, family on, 219
 Farms, increase of population on,
 143
 Fatherhood, education for, 182
 new conception of, 252
 Fear as means of social control, 117
 Fecundity of city population, 126, 132
 eugenically superior, 127
 farm population, 127
 rich and poor, 133
 young wives, 24
 in United States, 143
 Feeble-mindedness and illegitimacy,
 102
 marriage, 30
 reproduction, 137
 Feminism and endowment of mother-
 hood, 213
 attitude toward the home, 232, 248,
 250
 in history, 196
 training of children, 187
 Fertility, need for research on, 226
 related to age of marriage, 24
 statistics of, 95
 Finger-prints, registration of, 226
 Filsinger, Mrs. Ernst B., 198
 First-born child, defects of, 37
 predominance of boys among, 153
 Flirtation, necessity of, 191
 Foerster, F. W., 19, 110, 255
 Foster children, 42
 France, population problem in, 139,
 143, 211
 Frankenthal, Käte, 116, 255

Freedom in marriage, 16
 of action, 158
 of opinion, 159
 of women in home, 233
 of women in marriage, 194
 restrictions on individual, 157
 Free love, examination of, 11
 lack of dignity in, 235
 unlikelihood of, 253
 Freud, Sigmund, 64, 65, 241
 Freund, Ernst, 107, 111, 255

G

Galahad, Sir, 188
 Galloway, Thomas W., vii, 183
 Galton, Francis, 99, 225, 255
 Genealogy, influence of, 235
 Genius and reproduction, 53, 230
 Germ-plasm, continuity of, 53
 Gilman, Charlotte Perkins, 187
 Gonorrhea as bar to marriage, 31
 frequency of, 91
 result of incontinence, 56
 Goodsell, Willystine, 6, 255
 Gorki, Maxim, 201
 Greece, customs of ancient, 50, 197,
 203, 251
 Gulick, Charlotte V., 187
 Gynecology, need for research in, 226
 place of, in Birth Control, 147

H

Hadfield, J. A., 64, 256
 Haines, Thomas H., vii
 Hall, Fred S., 29, 256
 Halverson, H. J., 137, 256
 Happiness, individual, in marriage,
 16, 74, 194, 254
 Hardy, Thomas, 110
 Harris, John W., 24, 256
 Harrison, Paul W., 18, 256
 Hebrews, celibacy among, 49

Heredity as basis of sex education, 168
 importance of, in education, 43
 importance recognized, 252
 of illegitimate children, 104
 Hetairae, modern, 195
 Hill, J. A., 95, 256
 Hill, Leonard, 95, 256
 Hippopotami, mating among, 10
 Holland, source of Birth Control
 canards, 145
 Holmes, S. J., 131, 143, 256
 Homes, influence of, 41
 reasons for breakage of, 72
 types of broken, 72
 Hope, Laurence, 198
 Housing difficulties, 239
 Houssay, Frédéric, 95, 256
 Howard, G. E., 6, 256

I

Ibn Sa'ud, Sultan of Najd, 18
 Illegitimacy, discussion of, 100
 Immigrants, fecundity of, in United
 States, 95, 143
 influence of, on family, 245
 Impotence as ground for divorce, 82
 Income and birth rate, 206
 tax, 216, 218
 Incontinence, cause of disappointment
 in marriage, 77
 discussion of, 56
 Individualism, an obsolete doctrine,
 159
 in art, 198
 Infant mortality, 205
 Infertility, discussion of, 95
 ground for divorce, 82
 Insanity as bar to marriage, 30
 as ground for divorce, 82
 resulting from syphilis, 92
 Insurance, family, 214
 Irresponsibility in free love matings, 15
 Isis-Madonna tradition, 234

J

- James, William, 191
 Jesus, attitude of, toward marriage, 49
 Johnson, Bascom, 84, 256
 Johnson, Roswell H., vii, 26, 56, 58,
 68, 107, 135, 148, 149, 256, 257
 Joyce, James, 241
 Jukes, fecundity of, 137

K

- Kellogg, John Harvey, 225, 256
 Key, Ellen, 193
 Kin, marriage of, 29
 Kneeland, George J., 84
 Koegel, Otto E., 34, 256
 Kuhn, Philaetes, 225

L

- L'Aiglon*, 188
 Latin America, incontinence in, 60, 63
 Law Enforcement against prostitu-
 tion, 90
 in broken homes, 81
 to combat abortion, 124
 voluntary organization for, 240
 Lea, H. C., 50, 256
 Lecky, W. E. H., 248, 256
 Lenroot, K. F., 101, 102, 103, 256
 Lenz, Fritz, 82, 256
 Lethal factors in human matings, 97
 Letourneau, Ch., 5, 256
 Love as a necessity in marriage, 74, 79
 free, examination of, 11
 oriental definitions of, 75
 teaching of art of, 195
 Luce, G. R., vii
 Lundberg, Emma O., 102, 257

M

- Macaulay, Thomas Babington, 198

Maladjustment, sexual, in marriage,
 79

- Malthus, Thomas R., 144
 Marchant, James, 256
 Maria Luisa of Austria, 97
 Marriage, common law, 33
 forced, 110
 of the future, 253
 necessary changes in, 194
 promotion of, 226
 rate in United States, 131
 restrictions on, 28
 trial, 13
 Masudi, discussion of love in, 75
 Matchmaking, 193
 Maternity benefits, 212
 Mating, types of, 9
 Maturity, physical, 24
 Mayflower descendants, 143
 Maynard, G. D., 24, 257
 McDougall, William, 225, 257
 Medical profession, attitude toward
 marriage laws, 32
 and sex education, 175
 Mencken, H. L., 203
 Menopause, sexual interest during,
 77
 Menstruation, 173
 Mental defects in marriage, 30
 Mental deficiency among prostitutes,
 85
 deficiency and illegitimacy, 102
 development, completion of, 24
 Meyer, A. W., 113, 257
 Michelet, Jules, 197
 Mill, John Stuart, 158, 257
 Millionaires, families of, 134
 Minimum Wage, 208
 Miscarriages and abortions, 113
 due to syphilis, 93
 Mismatching, fundamental evil in
 family life, 250
 Monkeys, mating among, 10

Monogamy, adaptation of mankind
 to, 4
 discussion of, 19
 future of, 253
 ideal of, 3
 Montessori Method, 228
 Morality, double standard of, 61,
 253
 "Morality, The New," 11
 Mortality, infant, 205
 Mothercraft in women's colleges, 181
 teaching of, 174
 Motherhood, endowment of, 213
 Mothers' pensions, 214
 Motion pictures, 199, 203, 240
 Mudgett, Mildred D., 80, 257
 Music as career for women, 26
 Muslims, marriage among, 18

N

Napoleon I, 97, 106
 Nature study in schools, 170
 Negro mothers, young, 24
 prostitutes, 85
 Negroes, decline of fecundity among,
 99
 early marriage of, 68
 fecundity of, 95
 illegitimacy among, 100
 ravages of gonorrhea among, 98
 Neuroses due to delayed marriage,
 69
 New Zealand, fecundity in, 24
 Nicolson, Mrs. Malcolm H., 198
 Nomadism, 235
 Noyes, Hilda H., 214, 257
 Nuns, celibacy of, 54

O

Obstetrics, need for research in, 226
 Orphans in asylums, 42, 103
 O'Shea, M. V., 179, 257

P

Parenthood, quality of, in monogamy,
 21
 training for, 178, 221
 voluntary, 151, 252
 Parker, Cornelia Stratton, 197, 257
 Parker, Valeria H., vii
 Parkes, A. S., 17, 257
 Paul as champion of asceticism, 49, 51
 Peck, M. W., 60, 64, 257
 Pensions, mothers', 214
Peter Pan, 188
 Philby, H. St. J. B., 18, 257
 Physical defects as bar to marriage, 31
 Pinkham, Lydia E., 141
 Pinney, J. B., vii
 Politics a factor in prostitution, 88
 Polyandry, discussion of, 17
 Polygamy, examination of, 17
 Polygyny, discussion of, 17
 Pompadour, Madame de, 201
 Popenoe, Paul, 17, 129, 137, 256, 257
 Population, movement of, in United
 States, 143
 problem, 141
 Pornography, 198
 Posture, adaptation to upright, 4
 Precocity of sex development, 190
 Pregnancy, benefit of, to woman, 36
 effect of, on free love, 12
 popular attitude toward, 197
 Priests, celibacy of, 49
 Promiscuity and Birth Control, 141, 152
 attitude toward, 249
 examination of, 9, 21
 Prostitution and euphemy, 201
 as source of venereal diseases, 92
 children's knowledge of, 171
 discussion of, 84
 expense of, 57
 passing of legalized, 248, 253
 relation to delayed marriage, 68
 responsible for incontinence, 62

Pseudo-celibacy, 51
 Puberty, change in child at, 172
 hygiene of, 226
 Publicity of divorce proceedings, 81

R

Race as a factor in divorce, 80
 Rageot, Gaston, 197, 257
 Recreation, need for, 239
 Red Light Districts, 89, 161, 248
 Reformation, relationship to celibacy, 52
 Registration of births, 225
 of eugenic families, 225
 of finger-prints, 226
 of illegitimate births, 105
 Reproductive system, maturity of, 24
 Restrictions on marriage, 28
 Reuter, E. B., 114, 257
 Richmond, Mary E., 29, 256
 Robinson, W. J., 113, 257
 Rodents, mating among, 10
 Roman Catholic attitude on Birth Control, 148
 celibacy, 51
 Romantic love, 20, 75
 Rome, causes leading to downfall of, 196, 203, 208, 251
 customs of ancient, 113, 197, 252
 Roosevelt, Theodore, 197
 Ross, E. A., 131
 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 42

S

San Francisco, prostitution in, 84
 Sanger, Margaret, 142, 149
 Savages, mating among, 9
 practice of abortion among, 114, 122
 romantic love among, 20
 School as a source of sex education, 170
 influence of teachers in, 169

Scotland, fecundity of young wives in, 24
 Seals, mating among, 10
 Segregation of defectives, 139, 237
 Selection, sexual, 23, 250
 and incontinence, 57
 Sex differentiation, 181, 187, 251
 education, 165
 quantitative nature of, 189
 Sexual selection, 23, 250
 selection and incontinence, 57
 maladjustment in marriage, 79
 Slee, Mrs. J. Noah H. (Margaret Sanger), 142, 149
 Sorokin, P., 134, 257
 Spencer, Anna Garlin, 19, 257
 Spencer, Herbert, 178, 186, 257
 Spinner, J. R., 114, 258
 Squirrels, mating among, 10
 Sterility and delayed marriage, 69
 due to gonorrhea, 15, 93, 96
 due to syphilis, 93
 general causes of, 95
 need for research on, 226
 Sterilization, eugenic, 138, 237
 Stopes, Marie C., 122
 Sumner, Francis B., 149
 Superior families, definition of, 125
 Swinburne, J., 217, 258
 Syphilis and incontinence, 56
 as bar to marriage, 31
 frequency of, 91

T

Taxation, bearing on family, 135, 215
 Teachers, influence on children of, 169, 170
 Teasdale, Sara, 198
 Thomas, Hayward G., 85
 Thompson, Warren S., 231, 258
 Tissier, L., 113, 258
 Treadway, Walter L., 85, 258

Trial marriage, 13, 79
 Tridon, André, 119, 258
 Tuberculosis as bar to marriage, 31
 Turkey, polygamy in, 19

V

Venereal diseases and delayed marriage, 69
 and incontinence, 56
 as bar to marriage, 31
 children's knowledge of, 171
 discussion of, 91
 effect of, on free love, 12
 Viability of fetus, age of, 120
 Vice and virtue, 190
 Vitamins as cause of barrenness, 98
 Voluntary parenthood, 151, 252

W

Wage, family, 209, 253
 minimum, 208
 Waggaman, Mary T., 211, 258
 Weldon, L. O., 86, 257

Wells, F. L., 60, 64, 257
 Wells, H. G., 15, 258
 Westermarck, Edward, 5
 Whales, mating among, 10
 Whetham, W. C. D., 170, 239, 258
 White, Stanford, 200
 Wilde, Oscar, 200
 Women, sexual nature of, 59
 workers, 230
 Women's colleges, deficiencies of, 179, 181
 Work of women outside of home, 228.
 organization of, in home, 227
 Worthington, George E., vii

X

X-rays as cause of sterility, 96

Y

Yerkes, Robert M., 176, 258
 Young Men's Christian Association, 227
 Women's Christian Association, 227

Sans Tache



Sans Tache

IN THE "elder days of art" each artist or craftsman enjoyed the privilege of independent creation. He carried through a process of manufacture from beginning to end. The scribe of the days before the printing press was such a craftsman. So was the printer in the days before the machine process. He stood or fell, as a craftsman, by the merit or demerit of his finished product.

Modern machine production has added much to the worker's productivity and to his material welfare; but it has deprived him of the old creative distinctiveness. His work is merged in the work of the team, and lost sight of as something representing him and his personality.

Many hands and minds contribute to the manufacture of a book, in this day of specialization. There are seven distinct major processes in the making of a book: The type must first be set; by the monotype method, there are two processes, the "keyboarding" of the MS and the casting of the type from the perforated paper rolls thus produced. Formulas and other intricate work must be hand-set; then the whole brought together ("composed") in its true order, made into pages and forms. The results must be checked by proof reading at each stage. Then comes the "make-ready" and press-run and finally the binding into volumes.

All of these processes, except that of binding into cloth or leather covers, are carried on under our roof.

The motto of the Waverly Press is *Sans Tache*. Our ideal is to manufacture books "*without blemish*"—worthy books, worthily

printed, with worthy typography—books to which we shall be proud to attach our imprint, made by craftsmen who are willing to accept open responsibility for their work, and who are entitled to credit for creditable performance.

The printing craftsman of today is quite as much a craftsman as his predecessor. There is quite as much discrimination between poor work and good. We are of the opinion that the individuality of the worker should not be wholly lost. The members of our staff who have contributed their skill of hand and brain to this volume are:

Composing Room: Nathan Miller, Ray Kauffman, Austin Uhland, Andrew Rassa, James Jackson, William Sanders, Edgar Simmons, Arthur Baker, Howard Fogle, Herbert Leitch, John Krantz, Charles Wyatt, Edward Rice, George Moss, Walter Phillips, Richard King, Henry Shea, Theodore Nilson.

Keyboard: Minnie Foard, Harry Susemihl, Helen Twardowicz.

Casters: Kenneth Brown, Ernest Wann, Mahlon Robinson, Charles Aher, George Smith, Frank Malanowsky, Martin Griffen, Henry Lee, Frederick Wall.

Cutler: H. S. Brown.

Folder: Laurence Krug, John Watson.

Proof Room: Sarah Katzin, Alice Reuter, Mary Reed, Ruth Treischman, Lucille Bull, Ethel Strasinger, Dorothy Strasinger, Audrey Tanner, Angeline Eifert, Lillian Gilland, Geraldine Browne, George Southworth, Ida Zimmerman.

Press: August Hildebrandt, Hugh Gardner, Henry Eckert, Andrew Becker.

Books on Social Science and Eugenics

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY— <i>Dunlap</i>	\$4.00
ESSENTIALS OF PSYCHIATRY— <i>Henry</i>	2.75
PUBLIC HEALTH LAW— <i>Tobey</i>	4.50
EUGENICS, GENETICS AND THE FAMILY, I. EUGENICS IN RACE AND STATE, II— <i>Daven-</i> <i>port and others</i>	11.00
EXHIBITS BOOK OF THE SECOND INTERNA- TIONAL CONGRESS OF EUGENICS— <i>Laugh-</i> <i>lin and others</i>	3.00
AN APPROACH TO SOCIAL MEDICINE— <i>Dun-</i> <i>ham</i>	4.00
INTELLIGENCE AND IMMIGRATION — <i>Kirk-</i> <i>patrick</i>	4.00
MONGREL VIRGINIANS— <i>Estabrook and Mc-</i> <i>Dougle</i>	3.00
THE INHERITANCE OF MENTAL DISEASES— <i>Myerson</i>	5.00

Send for a complete catalogue

THE WILLIAMS & WILKINS COMPANY

Publishers of Scientific Books and Periodicals

BALTIMORE, U. S. A.

